

THE CROWDS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

J. R. C. Cousland

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
University of St Andrews



1992

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/14106>

This item is protected by original copyright

THE CROWDS IN THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

J. R. C. COUSLAND

© SEPTEMBER, 1991



ProQuest Number: 10170721

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10170721

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Th B56

I certify that J. R. C. Cousland has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1 (*as amended*), and is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. _____

Signature of supervisor

I was admitted as a research student under Ordinance 350 (General No. 12) on October, 1982 and as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D. under Resolution of the University Court, 1967, No. 1 (*as amended*).

The following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, is my own composition, and has not previously been presented for a higher degree. The research was carried out in the University of St Andrews under the supervision of Dr. Ronald A. Piper.

Signature of candidate

DECLARATION

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any *bona fide* library or research worker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of Universities of the United Kingdom, and the University of St. Andrews. The former made an Overseas Research Student Award available to me, while the latter gave me a University Research Studentship. Without the assistance of both bodies I would have been unable to pursue my research.

I would also like to thank my advisor, Dr. Ronald Piper, for his unfailing patience and his percipient advice, both of which contributed substantially to this thesis. Peter Coxon has been a great support, and I am more than grateful to my former professors in Canada - William Nicholls, Charles Anderson, Haijo Westra, and Hugo Meynell.

Before embarking on my postgraduate studies I heard that life as a postgraduate student was a solitary affair, where you had to do everything on your own, cut off from friends and family. It's been most gratifying to learn that, for me at least, this has not been the case at all. In fact, but for my family and friends, it is likely that I never would have been able to finish at all. I owe a big debt of thanks to my family, Anne, Ian, Irene and Alastair, as well as to the Thomsons who made me so much a part of their family.

My friends have also been a tremendous support, especially Dave Whelan who read it at a critical juncture, Hugh Scheuerman who did everything but write it for me, and Dave Leman who spent a week editing the final product. Grace Morgan offered her unflagging support, and the Helms, Mike Treschow, Matthew Allen and Iain and Hugh Morgan were invariably a great source of encouragement. Jim Hume and Caroline Lee cheerfully took on the joyless task of reading the first drafts, and there are many who also ought to be mentioned here. Martin Cropp and the Department of Classics at the University of Calgary have also been especially supportive, and our former secretary Vi Lake was instrumental in typing the final product, while Lillian Kogawa helped with the final printing.

ABSTRACT

Of the three major groups in Matthew's gospel, the disciples, the Jewish leaders and the crowds, it is the last of these, the crowds, which is most ambiguous. While the disposition of the disciples and the Jewish leaders toward Jesus is readily apparent, it is less so with the crowds. They have been characterized as ambivalent in their relationship to Jesus, and this ambivalence is borne out by the fact that some scholars have readily interpreted them in a negative light, others in a more positive light. As neither of these interpretations is especially compelling, the problem of the crowds has reached a critical impasse. It is the intention of this work to resolve this impasse, and explain the ambiguities of Matthew's portrayal, by offering a full-fledged examination of Matthew's understanding of the ὄχλοι.

It begins by analyzing Matthew's use of the word ὄχλος, and determines that this word alone is used to refer to the crowds, and denotes a specific group. Matthew does rely on his sources for his portrayal of the crowds, but he has both clarified and stylized the portrayal. When Matthew's contradictory mission directives are analyzed, it emerges that the crowds are Jewish.

After defining the crowds, it goes on to examine the crowds' actions and statements. It begins with a discussion of the crowds following of Jesus, and determines that the crowds follow Jesus not out of a "qualitative allegiance", but because they are needy. The crowds' astonishment in the face of Jesus' words and deeds does not indicate commitment on their part, but rather an incipient favourable response to Jesus. Their use of the title "Son of David" indicates a growing insight into Jesus' true nature, but one that ultimately fails to develop. Their designation of Jesus as "a prophet" indicates the inadequacy of their perceptions. It also adumbrates their final rejection of Jesus, a rejection which culminates in their joining with their leaders to

accept responsibility for Jesus' death. The reproaches levelled against the crowds by Jesus in chapter 13 do not readily fit in with this portrayal of the crowds of Jesus' day, and are best seen as referring to the experience of Matthew's church.

When the crowds are examined in the timeframe of Matthew's church, they are best regarded as Jews, and not members of Matthew's church. They are attracted to the church because of its authority to heal and forgive sins. They attach themselves to the community in large numbers, listen to the church's kerygma, but ultimately fall away when the church loses its thaumaturgic ability. Persecution by the Jewish leaders, particularly the Pharisees, may have provoked this crisis. After this, the crowds no longer heed the community's message, and appear to fall back under the sway of the Pharisees. Matthew's church reproaches the crowd for its obduracy, and embarks on its mission to all nations.

The ambiguity in Matthew's depiction of the crowds is the result of two factors. In his portrayal of the crowds of Jesus' day, the ὄχλοι are used with two contradictory intentions in mind. On the one hand, they are used christologically to enhance the picture of Jesus, and to represent the side of Israel which welcomes its messiah. On the other hand, they are used apologetically, to show how Israel missed its messiah and ended up putting him to death.

The second reason for the ambiguity of Matthew's account, is that the crowds sometimes, particularly in Matthew 13, represent the crowds of Matthew's day. This juxtaposition of the two temporal levels produces a refracted picture of the crowds, which also makes them appear ambiguous.

DEDICATED TO GRAN, NAN, AND KENNETH

ABBREVIATIONS

For the abbreviation of most ancient documents I follow the conventions of James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (London, 1982) xlv-1. For the Dead Sea Scrolls see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Missoula, Mont., 1977) 1-53. Unless otherwise stated, my citations of classical authors are from the Loeb Classical Library (LCL), my citations of the Mishnah from H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (Oxford, 1933) and my citations of the Babylonian Talmud from the Soncino Edition. Periodicals and other works which are frequently cited follow the abbreviations given below.

AB	Anchor Bible
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
ASNU	Acta seminarii neotestamentici Upsaliensis
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
ATR	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, and Debrunner, Albert, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , trans. & ed. Robert W. Funk.
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium
BevTh	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BFChTh	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BHH	<i>Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
B&L	<i>Bible und Leben</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW
CB	Coniectanea biblica
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
Conc	Concilium
CThM	Calwer theologische Monographien
EKK	Evangelische-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
EvT	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
ET	<i>Expository Times</i>

ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses</i>
EWNT	<i>Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> (H. Balz, G. Schneider, eds.) 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1980-83).
FB	Forschungen zur Bibel
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HST	Rudolf Bultmann, <i>History of the Synoptic Tradition</i> , tr. John Marsh, (Oxford, 1968).
HThK	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IBS	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures
DB	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTC	<i>Journal of Theology and the Church</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio divina
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . New Ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
MK	Meyer Kommentar
NIDNTT	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i>
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NRT	<i>Nouvelle revue théologique</i>
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBL	Orientalia et biblica Lovaniensia
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
PGC	Pelican Gospel Commentaries
PRS	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
QD	Quaestiones Disputatae
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RivB	<i>Rivista biblica</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
RThPh	<i>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</i>
SB	Strack, Hermann L. and Billerbeck, Paul, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> 4 vols., (Munich, 1922-8).
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
SBEC	Studia biblica et ecclesiastica
SBFLA	<i>Studii biblici Franciscani liber annuus</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBM	Stuttgarter biblische Monographien
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology

Scrip	Scripture
SE	<i>Studia Evangelica</i>
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTU	Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOED	Shorter Oxford English Dictionary
SR	<i>Studies in Religion/sciences religieuses</i>
SSM	W. D. Davies, <i>The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount</i> (Cambridge, 1963).
ST	<i>Studia theologica</i>
StANT	Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
TD	<i>Theology Digest</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
ThZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
TIM	G. Barth, G. Bornkamm and H. J. Held, <i>Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew</i> , tr. P. Scott et al. enlarged ed. (London, 1982).
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TQ	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>
TR	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TU	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i>
TWNT	<i>Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

PART I

1. INTRODUCTION	1
a. The Nature of the Problem	1
b. J. D. Kingsbury	5
c. Sjef Van Tilborg	8
d. Paul S. Minear	10
2. Proposal	14
a. Presuppositions and Methodology	15

PART II

1. INTRODUCTION	18
a. Use of the term ὄχλος in Matthew	19
b. The Distinctiveness of ὄχλος	22
c. Conclusion	29
2. THE ETHNIC CHARACTER OF THE CROWDS	29
a. Particularism and Universalism in Matthew's Community	35
b. Conclusion	41
3. ἈΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΩ	43
a. The Crowds and the Demands of Jesus	44
b. The Call of Jesus	46
c. The Following of the Crowds	49
d. Conclusion	53
4. THE RESPONSE OF THE CROWDS TO JESUS	54
a. ἐκπλήσσομαι	54
b. θαυμάζω	56
c. ἐξίστημι	57
d. φοβέομαι	57
e. δοξάζω	58
f. The Responses in Direct Speech	62
g. Conclusion	65
5. JESUS' MINISTRY TO THE CROWDS	67
a. κηρύσσω	67
b. διδάσκω	68
c. θεραπεύω	72
d. Conclusion	77
6. SON OF DAVID	77
a. Prelude	77
b. The Genealogy and the Son of David	79
c. The Therapeutic Son of David	85
d. The Crowds and the Son of David	91
e. Conclusion	96
7. PROPHET	97
a. Prelude	97
b. The Eschatological Prophet	99
c. The Eschatological Prophet at 21:11?	104

d. The Prophets and the Crowds	107
e. Conclusion	111
8. MATTHEW 13	111
a. The Crowds and the Great Discourses	112
b. The Portrait of the Crowds in Chapter 13	117
c. Parables	120
d. Matthew 13:10-23	123
e. Matthew 13:18-23	127
f. Conclusion	129
9. THE CROWDS' REJECTION OF JESUS	130
a. The Volte-Face of the Crowds	130
b. The Crowd in the Barabbas Episode (27:15-26)	133
c. Conclusion	139
10. CONCLUSION	140

PART III

1. INTRODUCTION	142
2. THE GROUPS IN MATTHEW	144
a. The Disciples	144
b. The Jewish Leaders	145
c. The Crowds	148
d. Conclusion	154
3. THE MINISTRY OF MATTHEW'S COMMUNITY	155
a. Prelude	155
b. The Ministry of the Community	156
c. 9:8	159
d. 9:32-34; 12:22-24	161
e. Conclusion	168
4. PERSECUTION	168
a. Discussion	168
b. Conclusion	173
5. DOUBT IN THE COMMUNITY	174
a. The Healing of the Epileptic	174
b. Peter's Walking on the Water	176
c. 28:18	178
d. Conclusion	180
6. THE VOLTE FACE OF THE CROWDS	182
a. 27:62-66	182
b. Matthew 13	184
c. Conclusion	188
7. CONCLUSION	189

PART IV

1. CONCLUSION	192
---------------	-----

2. BIBLIOGRAPHY	194
a. Reference Works	194
b. Commentaries	195
c. Monographs and Essays	197

PART I

1. INTRODUCTION

1a. *The Nature of the Problem*

Over the last few decades, the crowds in the Gospel of Matthew have begun to receive the attention of scholars.¹ Notwithstanding this attention, or perhaps because of it, there is hardly any unanimity of opinion to be found concerning the place of the crowds in the gospel. E. P. Sanders has remarked that "The crowds in the Gospels and Acts serve the convenience of the narrator",² but it has to be asked whether perhaps they do not also serve the convenience of the exegete. Certainly in Matthean studies, the spectrum of views which the crowds have engendered is startling, and it would be far from wrong to say that there is virtually no critical consensus about the crowds' role in the gospel.

An example might help to make this more vivid. What might a scholar, unfamiliar with the discipline, discover, if he were interested in obtaining a quick overview of the crowds and their place in Matthew's gospel? He would find disagreement, for one thing. He would soon discover that even the most basic questions he posed would evoke widely divergent viewpoints. Let us consider some of the questions he might ask, and the sort of answers he might find in the critical literature on Matthew's gospel.

If, for instance, he were to ask about the significance of the ὄχλοι within the first gospel, he would find that for Vincent Mora "les foules tiennent une place énorme dans l'évangile de Matthieu".³ But for Georg Strecker, the crowds simply constitute an "applaudierender Hintergrund des Wirkens Jesu".⁴

¹ See the studies listed in note 81 below. As the plural form "crowds" is found more frequently in the gospel, this study will use it throughout for the sake of consistency. The name "Matthew" is used in what follows as a convenient designation for the final redactor, without making any claims as to his identity.

² E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*. (London: SCM, 1985) 289.

³ Vincent Mora, *Le Refus d'Israël: Matthieu 27, 25 LD 124*. (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1986) 135.

⁴ Georg Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*, 3

If he wished to ascertain whether the crowds had any theological importance to the gospel, he would learn from Robert Guelich that they "have little...as such in contrast to the evangelist's use of the people, the scribes and Pharisees, and the disciples".⁵ Terence Donaldson, on the other hand, would inform him that the crowds, like the other groups mentioned above, have a very definite role in the gospel, as those "whose eschatological status...remains open to the end".⁶ That is to say, he would find they have considerable theological importance.

Nor is this all. If he were to inquire about the crowds' character, J. D. Kingsbury would assure him that "the crowds...may be dealt with as a single, 'flat' character. They are not rich in traits, and the ones they possess tend not to change until the end of Matthew's story, when they suddenly appear with Judas to arrest Jesus".⁷ Clifton Black, however, would insist "that the crowds be regarded as rather 'round' characters: albeit [*sic*] their minimalist representation, they are rather lifelike in their unpredictable vacillation and divided loyalty to Jesus".⁸

Our hypothetical scholar would not even be able to ascertain whether the crowds are historical figures, nor their ethnic makeup. He would find that to Donald Verseput, the crowds are historicized - "wrapped in a cloak of unrepeatability",⁹ and consist solely of the Jews of Jesus' own day. To Joseph Comber, by contrast, "the crowds of the gospel narrative are a cipher for the Jewish people of Matthew's time".¹⁰ Yet he could not even be sure they were Jewish. If he turned to Robert Gundry's

Auf. FRLANT 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 107.

⁵ Robert A. Guelich, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding* (Waco: Word, 1982) 49.

⁶ Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* JSNTSS 8 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985) 207.

⁷ Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 23.

⁸ C. Clifton Black II, "Depth of Characterization and Degrees of Faith in Matthew", *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 604-23, 619. According to Kingsbury, (*Story* 10 and cf. Black "Depth" 605) "'Round characters' are those who possess a variety of traits, some of which may even conflict, so that their behaviour is not necessarily predictable; round characters are like 'real people'....'Flat' characters are those who possess few traits and are therefore highly predictable in their behaviour".

⁹ Donald J. Verseput, *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1986) 48. See, too, David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23*, NovTSup LII (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979) 38-39.

¹⁰ Joseph A. Comber, "The Verb Therapeuō in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 97 (1978) 431-34, 433.

commentary, he would find that they are "the masses in the Church...the result of extensive evangelism among the Gentiles".¹¹

In short, he would find hardly any agreement among these scholars about the place of the crowds in Matthew's gospel. According to them (and their judgements are not unrepresentative), the crowds could be either Jewish or gentile, historicized or transparent,¹² and important or minor figures within the gospel framework. While a broad range of opinion is not uncommon within New Testament scholarship, it might be said that the case of the crowds, with their chameleon-like capacity to fit a variety of interpretations, is uncommon.

The reasons for such a state of affairs are not difficult to isolate. Pre-eminent is the fact that the crowds have almost always been considered *en passant*. In Matthean scholarship, discussion of the crowds has usually been made ancillary to other questions because the crowds are generally regarded (with some justice) as secondary figures. An examination of the amount of space accorded to them in recent works on Matthew shows that they are usually treated in three to four pages at most.¹³ Apart from a few longer treatments of the crowds, which will be discussed presently, there has been no full-scale analysis of the crowds in Matthew's gospel.

A second reason is that Matthew's depiction of the crowds is itself amenable to a variety of interpretations. At the root of his portrayal is what can only be described as a fundamental ambivalence¹⁴ which makes it far from clear how the crowds are to be

¹¹ Robert H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 64-65, cf. 8-9.

¹² For the expression "transparent" see Ulrich Luz, "The Disciples in the Gospel according to Matthew" in G. Stanton (ed.) *The Interpretation of Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1983) 98-128, 98ff. By "transparent" I mean elements in the gospel account which can be understood as allusions to the post-Easter situation of Matthew's community. Cf. the illuminating remarks by Gerhard Lohfink, "Wem gilt die Bergpredigt?" *TQ* 163 (1983) 264-84, 266 #13.

¹³ See Ch.2, #1 below for a survey of recent works which touch on the crowds. As these assessments of the crowds are sometimes subordinated to larger issues (be it Matthew's view of *Heilsgeschichte*, his community or whatever) it is not surprising that the perspectives taken on these larger issues also frequently colour the perception of the crowds. (Here, instead of chameleons, the crowds might more fittingly be described as litmus paper)

¹⁴ The word ambivalence is used by James M. Gibbs, "The Son of God as Torah Incarnate in Matthew" *SE* IV, *TU* 102 (1968) 38-46; 45#5, and T. Donaldson, *Mountain*, 114. J. Murphy-O'Connor ("The Structure of Mt XIV - XVII" *RB* 82 (1975) 360-84, 376#44 (cont'd. 377)) describes the verbal reaction to Jesus as "highly ambiguous". Horst Balz ("ὄχλος" *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* II col 1355 - hereafter *EWNT*) uses the term *Doppelgesichtigkeit* of the crowds in all four gospels.

construed. On the one hand, the crowds generally appear well-disposed toward Jesus. They are astonished at his words and deeds (7:28; 9:33; 12:23; 15:31; 22:33). They follow him (4:25; 8:1; (12:15); 14:13; 19:2; 20:29; 21:9) and acclaim him as a prophet (21:11; cf. 21:46), and more importantly, as the Son of David (21:9; cf. 12:23). On the other hand, the crowds are characterized by Jesus, in chapter 13, as being without understanding (13:10-17), and later in the gospel they come with Judas to arrest Jesus (26:47), and ultimately, join with their leaders in accepting responsibility for his death (27:24-25).

These "Jekyll and Hyde" features sit together uneasily in Matthew's gospel. If the crowds are indeed already devoid of understanding at chapter 13, what is to be made of their confession of Jesus as the Son of David during the triumphal entry (21:9)? And why should this fundamental insight then be followed by a complete *volte face* in which the crowds take up with their hardened leaders? Such questions are not readily resolved, and the solution which has generally prevailed has been to accentuate either the positive depiction of the crowd, or the negative one.¹⁵ No study thus far has been able to account for both features of the crowds.

A factor which has made the problem even more intractable has been a tendency for some scholars to interpret the crowds in light of Matthew's contemporary situation, after paying only cursory attention to the crowds' role at the historical level¹⁶ of the gospel. It is obvious that such a skewed methodology is going to produce skewed results, and this may help to explain why the crowds are identified above both as the Jews of Matthew's own day, and Matthew's community (be it Jewish or gentile).

¹⁵ On occasion, the crowds are also described as being "neutral", but such a view obviously compounds the problems. Cf., among others, Guelich, *Sermon*, 59, "a neutral chorus".

¹⁶ By "historical" I do not necessarily refer to a factual relation of events, but to Matthew's *ιστορία* of events, with *ιστορία* understood in the sense of "story" or "narrative" or "history"; Cf. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, new edition, rev. Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) s.v. def. II. (hereafter *LSJ*). By "historical level" then, I mean Matthew's story of Jesus as opposed to the "transparent level" which would refer to the post-Easter situation of Matthew's church. This is not to deny that there is also an "historical" component to the "transparent level", but Matthew's ostensible story, at least, is about Jesus. In using the word "level" I follow R. E. Brown, (*The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984) 125) although other terminology is frequently used (cf. Graham Stanton, "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism" *BJRL* 66 (1984) 264-84, 275, who refers to a "dual perspective", or J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1979) 29 #22, who differentiates between the 'einmalig' and 'contemporary' frames of reference.).

Unfortunately, these difficulties afflict even the most influential and extensive studies that have been made of the crowds thus far, those undertaken by J. D. Kingsbury,¹⁷ S. Van Tilborg,¹⁸ and Paul Minear.¹⁹ A brief account of their findings will make this apparent.

1b. J. D. Kingsbury

One of the most influential studies of the crowds is that found in J. D. Kingsbury's *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13, A Study in Redaction Criticism*.²⁰ This work argues that "the function of Chapter 13 within the groundplan of Matthew's Gospel is to signal the great 'turning point' "²¹ where Jesus turns away from "the Jews" (including the crowds) to his disciples. This turning point follows upon Matthew's account of Jesus' public ministry (Chapters 4-11) and the increasing animosity with which it is greeted by the Jews (Chapters 11-12). In chapter 13 Jesus turns away from them and decries them as being a people devoid of understanding. From this point onward he no longer speaks to them openly, but enigmatically in parables. By contrast, he speaks openly to his disciples, as the true people of God.²²

The crowds are an essential component of this schema. They, along with the Jewish leaders, comprise the "Jews". According to Kingsbury, Jesus' attitude to the crowds undergoes a marked change after chapter 13; he is no longer described as "preaching" or "teaching" them after this turning point. The introduction of the word παραβολή in chapter 13, and its frequency thereafter, indicates a deliberate shift to enigmatic speech. The use of the word αὐτοῖς as a *terminus technicus* for the crowds

¹⁷ Jack D. Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction Criticism* (London: SPCK, 1969).

¹⁸ Sjef Van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972).

¹⁹ Paul S. Minear, "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew" *ATR Sup.* 3 (1974) 28-44.

²⁰ 22-92 *passim* and esp. 24-28. Kingsbury's argument has had a considerable impact in Matthean studies. It is quoted with approval by Comber, "Verb", 431; John Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (New York: Crossroad, 1985) 83; Terence J. Keegan, "Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses" *CBQ* 44 (1982) 415-25, 423-24; Dan O. Via, Jr., *Self-Deception and Wholeness in Paul and Matthew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 100, among others.

²¹ Kingsbury, *Parables*, 130.

²² *Ibid.*, 16, 130.

also suggests that they are outside of the realm of salvation. In spite of this, Kingsbury does recognize that Matthew distinguishes the crowds from their leaders, even in the Passion account.²³ He maintains that "Matthew is fundamentally well-disposed towards them", and depicts the crowds as sharing directly in the ministry of Jesus.²⁴ Nonetheless, because the crowds stand beyond the pale of the Christian Church they are to be conjoined with their leaders.²⁵

Kingsbury's argument is effective, cogent and neat — perhaps too neat. The method he adopts for defining the crowds is particularly suspect, because, in effect, he defines them into perdition. As was pointed out, he acknowledges that Matthew distinguishes the crowds from their leaders, yet he refuses to treat them as distinct entities himself. The antipathy he remarks in Matthew 11 and 12, which precipitates his "turning point", comes largely from the Jewish leaders and not from the crowds, whose attitude is expressly contrasted with that of their leaders (cf. 12:22-24). Nevertheless, Kingsbury conjoins the two groups, designating them as "the Jews". This term is presupposed throughout his study without any explicit justification,²⁶ nor can it be said that Matthew's gospel itself offers any justification for it.²⁷

At first this grouping does not appear overly incongruous because Kingsbury interprets the crowds in light of the way they are characterized in chapter 13:

Previously (chaps. 11-12), Jesus was depicted in conflict with only individual segments of the Jewish nation. Now, however, he faces in the crowds the whole of unbelieving Judaism. So it is that Jesus in

²³ *Ibid.*, *Parables*, 25-26.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, *Parables*, 26-27.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, *Parables*, 28.

²⁶ Kingsbury's designation is, in part, explained by the following remarks "As it stands, it [sc. this portrayal of the crowds] appears to contradict our findings in Chapter 2, where we stated that the crowds in 13.1-35 represent the whole of unbelieving Judaism and that Jesus' speech in parables to them is essentially a scathing apology provoked by the Jews' rejection of him. But this apparent contradiction resolves itself when we observe that what Matthew in reality does in 13.1-35 is to single out and dwell on only one feature of his description of the Jewish crowds: the fact that they stand beyond the pale of the Church." (*Parables*, 27-28)

²⁷ Kingsbury's usage of the term appears to have been imported from John's gospel, as Matthew only uses 'Ιουδαῖοι once, at 28:15. Here however the time frame is different from the rest of the gospel—διεφθμίσθη ὁ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ 'Ιουδαίοις μέχρι τῆς σήμερον. Nor, for that matter are the Jews expressly associated with the crowds. The only other place where the crowds are joined with their leaders into a "people" (λαός) is at 27:25, though even here they are not called "the Jews".

13.1-35 vigorously assails the crowds for being *blind, deaf and without understanding* in regard to the things of salvation (cf. 13.10-13) ...In association with chapters 11-12, this apology [sc. 13.1-35] represents the reaction of Jesus to his rejection by the Jews on all sides.²⁸

When this passage is considered in detail, however, it does seem incongruous.²⁹ Why should the crowds be equated with the whole of unbelieving Judaism? Matthew assiduously distinguishes them from the Jewish leaders until the passion account. Up to that point the crowds, in contrast to their leaders, are largely receptive to Jesus.³⁰ Hence, Kingsbury is only able to support his definition by ignoring those aspects of Matthew's narrative which do not square with his interpretation.³¹

In fact, it soon becomes apparent that Kingsbury's argument works by confusing the time frames of the "historical level" of Jesus with the "transparent level" of the church. His references to 'Jews' and 'Judaism' relate to the time of the church, but are used to buttress what is, in fact, an argument about Jesus' activity (i.e. his turning away from the Jews) at the "historical level". This is not to deny that Matthew's situation could have (or did) influence his account of Jesus' actions, but Kingsbury approaches the question backwards. Instead of examining the narrative to see what it suggests about the relation of Matthew's community to Judaism, he decides in advance what that relation is, and then superimposes it onto Matthew's narrative.³² It is for this reason, ultimately, that his 'turning point' theory is flawed. It is an artificial construct that simply does not correspond to the narrative it purports to

²⁸ Kingsbury, *Parables*, 16. Italics his.

²⁹ E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, (*Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989) 207), who also single out this passage, suggest that Kingsbury offers an "exaggeration in two directions". First, the gospel gives indications of persecution or expected persecution prior to chapters 11-12, and second, the attitude of the crowds to Jesus vacillates before and after 12:46.

³⁰ Kingsbury appears to recognize this in his later work, *Matthew as Story* (3) "Until the passion...the crowds are generally well disposed towards Jesus. ".

³¹ See further, the detailed critical discussion of Kingsbury by Sanders and Davies in *Studying*, 203-20; 221, who also find that Kingsbury "repeatedly" ignores the narrative level of meaning.

³² Whether Kingsbury ultimately realizes that this is what he is doing is unclear. In his *Matthew as Story*, with its avowed sensitivity to the story of the gospel (1, 2) he is still capable of writing (in reference to 11:2-16:20) that "*Israel's* response to his [sc. Jesus'] ministry is one of repudiation." (77, italics mine).

describe.³³

1c. Sjef Van Tilborg

One study which has emerged with results very different from those of Kingsbury is that by Sjef Van Tilborg, *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. The purpose of his work is to examine the Jewish leaders. To do this effectively, Van Tilborg includes discussions of the other two groups in the gospel, the disciples and the crowds, as well as an account of how these groups interrelate.³⁴ In his examination of the crowds' relationships with the Jewish leaders, the disciples and Jesus, he discovers a range of responses. He finds that "the ὄχλοι, in contrast with the Jewish leaders, react very positively in the appearance of Jesus".³⁵ They approve of Jesus' teaching and recognize how it differs from that of their leaders.³⁶ The disciples occupy a "special position"³⁷ with respect to the crowds. They function not only as exemplars but also as mediators of Jesus to the crowds—"they bring the ὄχλοι into contact with Jesus".³⁸

Jesus' own relationship to the crowds can be considered a positive one. His benevolence is manifest in his speaking to and feeding of them, as well as in his compassion and willingness to heal them.³⁹ The crowds, in their turn, are astonished by him and come to him of their own volition. They obey him and, more significantly, they "do the same as the disciples have done: they follow Jesus".⁴⁰ This is central to Van Tilborg's depiction of the crowds, because "the following of Jesus is the definition of the essence of being Christian.... The ὄχλοι do what they have been asked to do by Jesus."⁴¹

³³ A more detailed refutation of specific points in Kingsbury's argument will be offered below.

³⁴ The disciples are discussed at 99-141, and the crowds at 142-65.

³⁵ Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 158.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 170.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 163, 171.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 163, 171.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 164, 171.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 164.

Van Tilborg explains Matthew's positive depiction of the crowds in light of Matthew's contemporary situation: "Presumably in Matthew's time Christ's message did not yet meet with any great resistance. Matthew sees how many people have been called to accept Jesus and his doctrine. On the basis of his own actual experiences he believes that also when Jesus was still alive great crowds accepted him. This has become an argument in his eyes to summon others to a similar acceptance".⁴²

While it is marked by keen insights—especially his consideration of the crowds in relation to the other actors in Matthew's gospel—his analysis is perhaps deficient in other respects. His assumption that the 'great crowds' mentioned in the narrative reflect the experiences of Matthew's community is valid so far as it goes, but ignores other likely possibilities. Could this not just as readily be construed as an instance of Matthew's exalted christology?⁴³

A related problem is his inability to account for the ambiguity in Matthew's depiction of the crowds. Matthew's gospel certainly presents the crowds in a positive light, and these features are well brought out by Van Tilborg. Yet he is less successful with the negative traits of the crowds as instanced in chapter 13 and the Passion account (27:20ff.). In both of these *Stellen*, Van Tilborg does recognise Matthew's editorial activity, but attempts, without much success, to minimize the discordancies.⁴⁴ With respect to chapter 13, for example, he candidly admits that the relationship between the crowds and the secret-theme taken over from Mark is obscure to him.⁴⁵ With 27:20ff. and the Passion account, he is unable to argue convincingly that Matthew's negative characterization of the crowd is determined by the tradition.⁴⁶ Thus his study, although it offers an effective counterbalance to Kingsbury, also fails to

⁴² *Ibid.*, 171.

⁴³ See further below note 89.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 159, 148-149 (on 27:20) and 161-162 (on Ch. 13).

⁴⁵ Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 161, "Matthew also borrows from Mark the secret-theme and he has strongly elaborated this theme by altering the ἱνὰ of Mark 4, 12 into the ὅτι of Matthew 13, 13. How this theme should be fitted into the whole of Matthew's concept remains obscure to me, unless the changes in Matthew 13, 10.13 are to be attributed to a pre-Matthean tradition".

⁴⁶ See the detailed critique of Van Tilborg's position by Fred W. Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus - Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew* (Washington: University Press of America, 1981) 405-409.

account for the crowds' ambiguity.

1d. *Paul S. Minear*

The paper which can be said to have pioneered discussion of the crowds in Matthew's gospel is Paul Minear's essay, "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew".⁴⁷ Minear begins by drawing a number of provisional conclusions, the first of which holds that "far from being an amorphous and neutral category, the *ochloi* played a highly positive role as followers of Jesus".⁴⁸ He suggests that the crowds constitute a major objective of Jesus' ministry and that the disciples are especially enjoined to continue this crowd-oriented ministry. Finally, he notes that the question of the crowds' allegiance forms the basis for the conflict between Jesus and his adversaries.⁴⁹ He corroborates part of this portrayal by examining the crowds in relation to the "five great discourses" in Matthew,⁵⁰ concluding that the crowds "surely corresponded to the 'laymen' of Matthew's day" while the disciples corresponded to the Christian leaders.⁵¹ In exercising their obligation to care for the laymen, these leaders fulfil the ministry that Jesus had entrusted to his disciples. Thus, when "the modern reader finds Jesus speaking to the crowds, he may ususally assume that Matthew was speaking to contemporary laymen. When he finds Jesus teaching the disciples, he may usually suppose that Matthew had in mind the vocation of contemporary leaders as stewards of Christ's household".⁵²

The difficulty with Minear's position is that he tends to assume the very thing

⁴⁷ His study, given its specific focus, is usually treated as the standard discussion of the crowds. (It is cited, for example, in G. Stanton's extensive survey of recent Matthean scholarship - "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945 to 1980" in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Principat. Religion* Band 25, 3 Teilband hrsg. W. Haase (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985) 1889-1951; 1928 (hereafter *ANRW*).). Minear has also made studies of the crowds in the other gospels, see below note 81.

⁴⁸ Minear, "Crowds", 31.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 31-32.

⁵⁰ Minear ("Crowds", 32) finds that the crowds "appear in either the introduction or the conclusion of all five 'sermons' attributed to Jesus, and that in two sermons they form part of his audience (13:1f.; 23:1f.)".

⁵¹ Minear, "Crowds", 41.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 41.

he ought to prove—namely, the highly favourable disposition of the crowds. This is not to deny that there are favourable components to the crowds' behaviour, but Minear's inductions frequently go beyond the evidence. He states for instance that "it is not an exaggeration to speak of them [sc. the crowds] as worshipping him",⁵³ yet never says why this is so. He adds that "since the editor does not show an interest in depicting the steps by which the crowds moved from less to greater faith, we infer that to Matthew the *ochloi* were characterized from the beginning by their acceptance of Jesus' message and his authority as prophet of God".⁵⁴ This summation once again makes some unwarranted assumptions. He speaks here of "faith" and sees it represented at 8:2 by the words and actions of the leper. It is certainly true that the leper has faith, but is it warranted to assume on that basis that the crowds have faith, especially when it is never said explicitly of them elsewhere? The προσέρχομαι at 8:2 is ambiguous - does the leper actually emerge from the crowds? The Mosaic law makes this even more questionable.⁵⁵

Further, Minear speaks of the crowds' "acceptance of Jesus' message" and "his authority as prophet of God",⁵⁶ yet the descriptions of the crowds do not bear out these observations. Certainly the crowds react to Jesus' message—they are astonished by it and they glorify God for giving such authority to men (7:28, 22:33, 9:8)—but they are never expressly depicted as accepting his message. That there is a considerable difference between the recognition of Jesus' authority and message, and the acceptance of it, is made evident by the pericope of the rich young man (19:16-30). Minear, for his part, assumes that "this acceptance entails at least a modicum of obligation to act in accordance with his disclosure of God's will".⁵⁷ This may well be so, but the gospel never gives us any indication that the crowds did in fact assume this obligation, rather, it suggests they did not (12:46-50).

Minear, like Van Tilborg, also fails to explain the crowds' negative portrayal in

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁵⁵ Cf. Lev 13:45-46.

⁵⁶ Minear, "Crowds", 30.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 30.

chapter 13 and the Passion narrative. He too, makes an appeal to the Markan substrate in chapter 13, though his main argument is to suggest that "*ochloi* had not by Matthew's day become a technical term to which a very specific ecclesiological content adhered".⁵⁸ Yet, do vagaries in the disciples' behaviour (e.g. Peter's betrayal) suggest that no very specific ecclesiological content adhered to the term μαθηταί either? Here Minear seems tempted to have it both ways.

Finally, Minear's assumption about the role of the crowds in Matthew's community is poorly substantiated.⁵⁹ He argues that "to the degree that these stories [sc. the Feeding narratives] were intended by Matthew to mirror later Eucharists to that same degree the *ochloi* represent the laity in those later gatherings".⁶⁰ So although he begs the question, he does not answer it. His identification also sidesteps the question of the crowds' negative features. Even leaving aside the recalcitrant problem of 27:24-25,⁶¹ could any future member of the laity fittingly be described as one "who has not", or one from whom "what he has will be taken away" (13:12)? This difficulty, like the others mentioned above, reveals deficiencies in Minear's assessment of the crowds.

All told, these three studies emerge with some key insights. They recognize the fundamental unity in Matthew's characterization of the crowds and have begun to isolate certain distinctive features of that characterization. All three studies also indicate, either explicitly, or implicitly, that the role of the crowd is relational, and deserves to be considered in light of the other groups in the gospel. This constitutes a considerable advance.

On the other hand, work remains to be done. It is perhaps ironic that these more elaborate studies suffer from the same problems which affect the more cursory treatments. Although they are more exhaustive, they are still not detailed enough.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁵⁹ Minear ("Crowds", 42) is aware of possible objections and acknowledges the "hypothetical" nature of his conclusions.

⁶⁰ Minear, "Crowds", 31.

⁶¹ See, though, Schweizer's grave reservations about Minear's identification: "Noch fraglicher scheint mir die Parallelisierung der Volksmenge mit dem Gemeindegliedern im Unterschied zu den durch die Jünger abgebildeten Leitern ...Dagegen spricht schon, daß die Volksmenge in 27,25 sich endgültig gegen Jesus entscheidet". (Eduard Schweizer, *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde*, SBS 71 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk 1974) 24#64).

Even here, two of the studies are not primarily concerned with the crowds. Kingsbury's study examines them to illumine Matthew 13, and Van Tilborg's book considers them to help situate the Jewish leaders. Only Minear's contribution is devoted solely to the crowds, and it is just a brief essay. Not one of the works considers the utterances or actions of the crowds in any depth, and in Kingsbury's case especially, it has to be asked whether his understanding of Matthew 13 has not perhaps coloured his perception of the crowds.

The problem of the crowds' ambivalence is also made explicit by these three studies. That they emerge with no agreement about the basic disposition of the crowds is especially eloquent. So too is the fact that their explanations of the crowds' apparent anomalies are not particularly compelling. Kingsbury's interpretation places all the emphasis on chapter 13 and (to a lesser degree) on the Passion account, while discounting the rest of the gospel narrative. Van Tilborg and Minear do exactly the reverse. Not one of the three even acknowledges the ambiguity inherent in Matthew's depiction of the crowds.

Finally, all three studies quickly dismiss the role of the crowds on the historical level and begin to assess them in light of Matthew's contemporary situation. This is particularly the case with Kingsbury and Minear who simply do not offer an adequate justification for their identification of the crowds. That it should be the "Jews" on one hand, and the "laymen of Matthew's Community" on the other, testifies to the problems inherent in their method.⁶² Obviously, if there is a picture of Matthew's situation to be gained from the gospel, it has to be one which is derived from express and careful reference to the gospel. One which fails to do this may well produce an imaginative reconstruction, but unfortunately, that is all it will produce.

Allied to this is the need to recognize that Matthew's representation of the

⁶² Nor is this apparently, an uncommon means of proceeding. Gundry informs his readers at the outset of his commentary that "the Jewish crowds symbolize the international church, including the many Gentiles who were later to become disciples (4:25 - 5:1 with 7:28 - 8:1; 21:8-9, 11)". (*Matthew*, 8-9, cf. 64-65). J. C. Fenton (*The Gospel of Saint Matthew*, PNTC (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963) 74) does the same. He simply acknowledges that the crowds "foreshadow the members of the Church whom Jesus will heal and teach through his disciples".

crowds is also intended to illumine the time of Jesus. It is not surprising that Meier has written of Minear's study that "there is ...a danger in so stressing the second horizon of the church's present state that the horizon of the sacred past is forgotten".⁶³ This caveat is well observed. Given the prominence of the crowds in the gospel at the historical level, it is apparent that an adequate study of the crowds needs to assess their significance within that framework. It is only when this has been sufficiently analyzed that it will become appropriate to consider the crowds in light of Matthew's own situation.⁶⁴

2. Proposal

The purpose of the following work is dictated largely by the problems outlined above. As no full scale treatment of the crowds in Matthew has yet been produced, an analysis of the crowds' role and function within the gospel should prove to be valuable, not least because it would help to resolve the ambivalence associated with the crowds. Yet it should also prove to be valuable in other respects. If, indeed, the crowds turn out to be Jewish (as, in fact, they do), Matthew's depiction of them could have much to say about how his community interacts with the rank and file of Judaism, as distinct from the Jewish leaders. That is to say, it should offer a more nuanced view of Matthew's community's perspective on Judaism, and offer a corrective to views, such as Walker's, that conceive of the Jews as a monolithic whole.⁶⁵

Accordingly, the first part of this work will consider Matthew's depiction of the crowds in Jesus' day. It will examine the use of the term ὄχλος in the first gospel, along with a discussion of the crowds' ethnic character. It will then consider various actions of the crowds—their following Jesus and their astonishment in the face of Jesus' actions, as well as their christological ascriptions to Jesus - Son of David and

⁶³ John P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17-48 AB 71* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976) 30#13. His criticism is also directed at H. Frankemölle "Amtskritik im Matthäus-Evangelium?" *Bib 54* (1973) 247-62; 254-57, 261.

⁶⁴ These remarks tacitly assume that for the crowds there is a second horizon of the "church's present state", an assumption that would not be held by some of the scholars mentioned above (cf. #9). This assumption will be justified below pp.

⁶⁵ R. Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

crowds is also intended to illumine the time of Jesus. It is not surprising that Meier has written of Minear's study that "there is ...a danger in so stressing the second horizon of the church's present state that the horizon of the sacred past is forgotten".⁶³ This caveat is well observed. Given the prominence of the crowds in the gospel at the historical level, it is apparent that an adequate study of the crowds needs to assess their significance within that framework. It is only when this has been sufficiently analyzed that it will become appropriate to consider the crowds in light of Matthew's own situation.⁶⁴

2. Proposal

The purpose of the following work is dictated largely by the problems outlined above. As no full scale treatment of the crowds in Matthew has yet been produced, an analysis of the crowds' role and function within the gospel should prove to be valuable, not least because it would help to resolve the ambivalence associated with the crowds. Yet it should also prove to be valuable in other respects. If, indeed, the crowds turn out to be Jewish (as, in fact, they do), Matthew's depiction of them could have much to say about how his community interacts with the rank and file of Judaism, as distinct from the Jewish leaders. That is to say, it should offer a more nuanced view of Matthew's community's perspective on Judaism, and offer a corrective to views, such as Walker's, that conceive of the Jews as a monolithic whole.⁶⁵

Accordingly, the first part of this work will consider Matthew's depiction of the crowds in Jesus' day. It will examine the use of the term ὄχλος in the first gospel, along with a discussion of the crowds' ethnic character. It will then consider various actions of the crowds—their following Jesus and their astonishment in the face of Jesus' actions, as well as their christological ascriptions to Jesus - Son of David and

⁶³ John P. Meier, *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17-48 AB 71* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976) 30#13. His criticism is also directed at H. Frankemölle "Amtskritik im Matthäus-Evangelium?" *Bib* 54 (1973) 247-62; 254-57, 261.

⁶⁴ These remarks tacitly assume that for the crowds there is a second horizon of the "church's present state", an assumption that would not be held by some of the scholars mentioned above (cf. #9). This assumption will be justified below pp. 142ff.

⁶⁵ R. Walker, *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

prophet. It will conclude with an examination of their role in Jesus' death.

The second part of the study will focus on the crowds at the time of Matthew's church, using Matthew's account of the church as a framework for understanding the crowds. In particular, it will demonstrate that the church initially undertook an effective healing ministry to the crowds, which was followed by an increasing disjunction between the two groups, resulting in a virtual estrangement between the two. It is this divorce, it will be shown, which ultimately explains the ambivalence underlying Matthew's depiction of the crowds.

2a. *Presuppositions and Methodology*

It has become almost customary for redaction-critical studies to subscribe reluctantly⁶⁶ to the two-source hypothesis, given the serious difficulties posed by the synoptic problem.⁶⁷ The position taken here will be no different,⁶⁸ except to note that there has recently been a resurgence of confidence in the insights afforded by the two-source hypothesis. Certainly, two of the most recent and detailed commentaries to appear on Matthew - those by Luz⁶⁹ and Davies and Allison,⁷⁰ have come out strongly in favour of this view. Particularly telling is the fact that Davies and Allison wanted to undertake their exegetical task "with open minds, and to discover just why the standard theory was suffering so much at the hands of so many",⁷¹ only to end up all the more firmly convinced of the viability of the two-source hypothesis.

As was stated, the method adopted here will be that of redaction criticism.⁷²

⁶⁶ Cf. the exemplary discussion offered by Meier, *Law*, 2-6. He notes with justice that "Experience has shown that the best support of the two-source hypothesis is perhaps not the positive argumentation for it, but rather any and every alternative solution offered to replace it." (6)

⁶⁷ On the synoptic problem, see the discussion and bibliography in W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, rev. ed. based on 17 ed. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, tr. H. C. Kee (London: SCM, 1975) 38-80.

⁶⁸ I think it likely that Matthew's *Sondergut* comes from a variety of sources, rather than a single source M, and that his version of Q differs in some respects from that of Luke.

⁶⁹ Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, tr. W. C. Linss (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989) 46-49.

⁷⁰ W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Vol. I, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988) 97-127.

⁷¹ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 98.

⁷² On redaction criticism see *inter alia* Norman Perrin, *What is Redaction Criticism*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) *passim*; Joachim Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*, tr. D. M. Barton (London: SCM, 1968) 1-16; Robert H. Stein, "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?" *JBL*

Nevertheless, because of the overemphasis on the transparent depiction of the crowds in earlier studies, the first part of this examination will consider Matthew's representation of the crowds within the framework of the historical account or narrative which he offers. This approach has several advantages. The first is that it would appear to be consistent with the literary form of the gospel, since Matthew, ostensibly at least, offers the reader an historical account or narrative of Jesus.⁷³ The second advantage is that such an approach is sensitive to what Sanders and Davies call the "narrative's own momentum", where details of the narrative need not necessarily reflect social concerns.⁷⁴ This method has one or two points in common with the "literary" or "narrative" criticism espoused by several scholars in the last few years.⁷⁵ The approach

88 (1969) 45-56; Sanders and Davies, *Studying*, 201-23.

⁷³ By narrative I mean "the representation of real or fictive events and situations in a time sequence" (Gerald Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Function of Narrative*. Janua Linguarum 108 (Berlin: Mouton, 1982) 1). That the first Gospel is a narrative is not generally disputed. What has recently been the subject of discussion is the extent to which it represents the entire Christian theology of the author. Up until the last decade the most prevalent view has maintained that the gospels represent "the apostolic kerygma built up into a vivid narrative form." (The phrase is from Charles H. Talbert, *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels* [London: SPCK, 1978; Fortress, 1977] 2.) He offers a selective representation of those who hold this view 18 #5. On the other hand, C.F.D. Moule has argued that the gospels were not "intended to present the full Christology and the full Christian theology of the Evangelists who wrote them or of any communities they may have represented." ("The Function of the Synoptic Gospels" in *Glaube und Eschatologie. F.S. für W.G. Kümmel zum 80 Geburtstag* hrsg. E. Gräßer, O. Merk (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 199-208, 207, and also see "The Intention of the Evangelists" in *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, ed., A.J.B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959) 164-179). Rather, they were designed to show how the pre-resurrection situation led to the post-resurrection situation ("Function" 208, "Intention" 173).

Moule's view has a good deal to commend it, and though Matthew's gospel does not lend itself to his thesis as readily as, say, the gospel of Luke, it can be, at least in part, understood in this light. Matthew's gospel however is best described as being in tension between the above two views, with the narrative being a product of both. This would help to explain why, for instance, Strecker can argue for an "historicizing" tendency in Matthew on the one hand (see Georg Strecker, "The Concept of History in Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 67-84, 70f.), and Trilling for an ecclesiastical emphasis (Wolfgang Trilling, "Matthäus, das kirchliche Evangelium: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Theologie" in *Gestalt und Ausdruck des Neuen Testaments* hrsg. J. Schreiner, G. Dautzenburg 2. Aufl. (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1969) 186-199, 192 and W. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangelium*, 3. Aufl. St ANT 10 (München: Kösel Verlag, 1964) 212 "Deutlicher als in jedem anderen Evangelium erscheint im Hintergrund von Matthäus das Bild einer 'Kirche', vergleichbar etwa mit dem Bild, das die Korintherbriefe von der Kirche in Korinth vermitteln!") on the other.

⁷⁴ Sanders and Davies, *Studying*, 221.

⁷⁵ For a brief account of the "narrative" approach cf. Rhoads and Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982) 1-5. For recent contributions with reference to Matthew cf. Richard A. Edwards, *Matthew's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) and *idem* "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples", in *Discipleship in the New Testament*, ed. Fernando Segovia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 47-61, and Jack Dean Kingsbury, "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary Critical Probe", 3-36 *JSNT* 21 (1984) along with David Hill's rejoinder "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Response to Professor Kingsbury's Literary Critical Probe", 37-52 *JSNT* 21 (1984). See also Kingsbury's *Story* and "The Developing Conflict between Jesus and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Literary-Critical

adopted here will differ from that taken by "narrative" critics in that, while it hopes to remain sensitive to the narrative as such, it will not disregard the question of Matthew's sources nor his own redactional intentions. For the second part of the study, a more typical redaction-critical method will be employed.

By doing so, it hopes to leave itself open to the more central issues of the gospel. Robert Morgan astutely notes that the formal literary categories of setting, plot and characters adopted by Rhoads and Michie (*Story*) "do not come to grips with the essential subject-matter of Mark. The analysis of Rhoads and Michie contributes something to the understanding of Mark's narrative, but seems tangential to the main point".⁷⁶ Morgan imputes this both to the fact that Mark is not a great literary artist and to the fact that features of the Synoptic Gospels constrain us "to read the Synoptic Gospels as historical narratives".⁷⁷ The second factor is especially germane to Matthew's gospel, and certainly most of the criticisms directed at Rhoads and Michie would apply equally well to some of the other works just mentioned.

Something similar must be said of structuralist criticism. While it is, at times, invaluable for illuminating the relationships of passages within given contexts,⁷⁸ it has been far less successful at transcending that context. This is largely because of the limitations in its methodology which require it to interpret texts relationally, most commonly in terms of oppositions. But as Graham Stanton has observed in his review of Daniel Patte's structuralist commentary,⁷⁹ this proves to be a less than adequate approach over the course of an entire gospel.

Study "CBQ 49 (1987) 57-73, as well as Dorothy J. Weaver, *Matthew's Literary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis* JSNTSS 38 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990).

⁷⁶ Robert Morgan (with John Barton), *Biblical Interpretation*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988) 234.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*,

⁷⁸ See, e.g., the intriguing paper by Christian Mellon, "La Parole: Manière de Parler, Manière d'Entendre" *RSR* 61 (1973) 49-63.

⁷⁹ Graham Stanton, "A Structuralist Approach to Matthew", *Int* 43 (1989) 184-86; Daniel Patte, *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987).

PART II

1. INTRODUCTION

It was observed in the first chapter that Matthew's portrayal of the crowds⁸⁰

⁸⁰ On the crowds in the first gospel see: Rudolf Meyer "ὄχλος" *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (hereafter TDNT) 5:582-90, Horst Balz "ὄχλος", *EWNT* II cols 1354-55, Hans Bietenhard "ὄχλος" s.v. 'People', *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (hereafter NIDNTT) II 800-1, H. Graf Reventlow "Volk", *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch* (hereafter BHH) 3: col 2112. In addition, see: Edward P. Blair, *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1960) 101-2; Fred W. Burnett, *Testament*, 404-411; Bernhard Citron, 'The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels', *SJT* 7 (1954) 408-18; Georg Eichholz, *Auslegung der Bergpredigt* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1965) 22-24; R. T. France, *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989) 225-27; David E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew* 23, *NovT* Sup 52 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979) 34-41, 210-215; James M. Gibbs, "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'" *NTS* 10 (1963-4) 446-464 (450-1, 460, 463-4); R. A. Guelich, *Sermon* 59, 49-50, 59; U. Hedinger, "Jesus und die Volksmenge", *TZ* 32 (1976) 201-206; P. Jouon, "'ΟΧΛΟΣ au sens de 'Peuple, Population' dans le Grec du Nouveau Testament et dans la Lettre d'Aristee" *RSR* 27 (1937) 618-619; T. J. Keegan, "Formulae" 425-428; J. D. Kingsbury, *Thirteen*, 24-28, X. Leon-Dufour, *Études d'Évangile. Parole de Dieu* (Paris: Le Seuil, 1965) 236-238; Robert Henry Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels: The Bampton Lectures 1934*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935) 39 #1-40; Paul S. Minear, "Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew", 28-44, and "False Prophecy and Hypocrisy in the Gospel of Matthew" in Joachim Gnllka (ed.) *Neues Testament und Kirche*. (Freiburg: Herder, 1974) 76-93, 78-79; V. Mora, *Refuse*, LD 124, 135-40; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Structure", 371-377; Akira Ogawa, *L'histoire de Jésus chez Matthieu: La signification de l'histoire pour la théologie Matthéenne* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1979) 215-222; E. A. Russell, "The Image of the Jew in Matthew's Gospel", *SE* 7, *TU* 126 (1982) 428-442; Alexander Sand, *Das Gesetz und die Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus*. BU 11 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1979) 149; Wolfgang Schenk, *Die Sprache des Matthäus: Die Texte-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostrukturellen Relationen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1987) 349-52; Donald P. Senior, "The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study", *BETL* 39, 149 #6-150; Georg Strecker, *Weg* 106-107, 116, 268 #3; Kari Syreeni, *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount*, Pt.1 *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fenicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum* 44. (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987) 111-12, 122-4; Raymond Thysman, *Communauté et Directives Éthiques: La Catéchèse de Matthieu. Recherches et Synthèses: Exégèse* 1 (Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1974) 19-23; Wolfgang Trilling, *Wahre*, 72, 75-76; C. H. Turner, "Notes and Studies: Marcan Usage: Notes Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel, Continued, Pt.V. The Movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd" *JTS* 26 (1925) 225-240; Sjef Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 142-165; D.J. Versepunt, *Rejection*, 46-48. See in addition J. A. Baird, *Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969) 37-46, though it is not used in the following examination because he did not base his results on individual gospels. His scheme of "disciple crowds" and "opponent crowds" is inappropriate to Matthew. See the critique in Paul S. Minear, "Audience Criticism and Marcan Ecclesiology" in H. Baltensweiler, B. Reicke (eds.) *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historische Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972) 79-90, 79 and #17, p. 88. To the above list should be appended the various commentaries on Matthew at 4:25, *passim*.

On the place of the crowd in the Gospel of Mark see: Ernest Best, "The Role of the Disciples in Mark", *NTS* 23 (1976-77) 377-401 (390-393); Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, "Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers", *NT* 28 (1986) 104-130; Paul S. Minear, "Audience", 79-90; A. W. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke", *NTS* 10 (1963-64) 139-149; David Rhoads and Donald Michie, *Story* 134-135; Kenzo Tagawa, *Miracles et Évangile: La Pensée Personnelle de l'Évangéliste Marc. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 62 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966) 55-73; C. H. Turner, "Notes", 225-240; Osmar Zizemer, *Das Verhältnis zwischen Jesus und Volk im Markusevangelium*. Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München (1983) *passim*.

On the place of the crowds in Luke see: Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* 5. Aufl. BHT 17 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964) 152-153 #1; Paul S. Minear, "Jesus' Audiences According to Luke" *NT* 16 (1974) 81-109; A. W. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences", 139-

was 'ambivalent', and has for this reason engendered a host of conflicting explanations. It is the intention of the first part of this chapter to present an evaluation of Matthew's descriptions of, and ascriptions to, the crowds in his gospel. This should make clear the degree to which he has relied on his sources, and the changes he has made to produce his own view of the crowds.⁸¹

1a. Use of the term ὄχλος in Matthew

In Matthew's gospel ὄχλος refers to a "crowd, throng, (multitude) of people" and "the (common) people, populace".⁸² The two senses here are not readily distinguished, since it is the populace who make up the crowd, and the crowd which, in effect, functions *pars pro toto* for the populace.⁸³

Matthew uses ὄχλος in conjunction with a number of other words to produce a variety of nuances: ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὄχλος πολὺς, πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι, πλεῖστος ὄχλος. By far the most common usage however is ὄχλος unqualified, either in the plural (most commonly) or the singular.⁸⁴

149; Paul Zingg, *Das Wachsen der Kirche*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974) 61-63.

⁸¹ Because Matthew is so clearly dependent on Mk and Q, it has not been considered necessary to undertake a survey of ὄχλος and related words up until the time of the New Testament. The basic lineaments of Matthew's conception are already present in Q, and especially in Mark.

⁸² Respectively definitions one and two of Bauer's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. and trans., W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957) 4th edition, hereinafter BAG. Cf. Walter Bauer, *Griechisches-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*. 5 Auflage (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971). Definitions 3 and 4 do not occur in Matthew. He does not use ὄχλος with the genitive (3), nor does he use it as a synonym for ἔθνος (4). On ἔθνος in Mt see G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946) 117-120.

Elsewhere the crowds in the gospels are described as a "Volksmenge" (Meyer "ὄχλος" 585 who rightly distinguishes [except in John] it from the ἡν ἦν 387-390; Kilpatrick, *Origins* 117) or Volk, Volksmenge, (große) Menge, Schar" (Balz "ὄχλος" col. 1354), or "the crowd, the mass, the populace" (Bietenhard, "ὄχλος", 800).

⁸³ This can be seen in a comparison of 21:26 with 21:46. The first presumably refers to the crowds immediately present, while the second to the populace (so Bauer). Both verses however are structured in a similar way, and the role of the crowds here is virtually identical. This is to say that although the distinction exists, it does not normally have currency for Matthew.

⁸⁴ ὄχλοι πολλοί: (6x) 4:25; 8:1; 12:15 (v.l.); 13:2; 15:30; 19:2. M. D. Goulder, (*Midrash and Lection in Matthew* - The Speakers Lectures In Biblical Studies (London: SPCK, 1974) 483), regards his as a "Matthean" expression (cf. his criteria 476). So too Rudolf Bultmann, (*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*), (henceforth *HST*) tr. John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968) 316, "In his editorial comments Matthew keeps on referring to the ὄχλοι πολλοί".

πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι (1x) 12:23

πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος (1x) 13:2b

πολὺς ὄχλος (attrib.) (1x) 14:14

ὄχλος πολὺς (2x) 20:29; 26:47

The word ὄχλος occurs more frequently in Matthew than in Mark or Luke (50, Mk-38, Lk-41).⁸⁵ Of these occurrences, roughly half are traditional (18 Mk, 8 Lk), twenty-three are redactional insertions⁸⁶ and one is unique to Matthew. Matthew's preference is for the plural form (31/50), while Mark, by contrast, uses the plural only once (// Mt 19:2 [pl]).⁸⁷ Matthew follows Mark's use of the singular in nine out of seventeen cases (or ten of eighteen if Mt 8:18 // Mk 4:36 is included), while all the material Matthew has in common with Luke is plural. Of Matthew's insertions, ten of twenty-three are in the singular while the only unique occurrence is plural.

Matthew's use of the plural is idiosyncratic, and can perhaps best be explained

πλεῖστος ὄχλος (1x) 21:8

ὄχλος (singular and plural - 38x) 5:1; 7:28; 8:18; 9:8; 9:23; 9:25; 9:33; 9:36; 11:7; 12:46; 13:34; 13:36; 14:5; 14:13; 14:15; 14:19; 14:19b; 14:22; 14:23; 15:10; 15:31; 15:32; 15:33; 15:35; 15:36; 15:39; 17:14; 20:31; 21:9; 21:11; 21:26; 21:46; 22:33; 23:1; 26:55; 27:15; 27:20; 27:24. Nigel Turner (J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. IV, *Style* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976] 43) argues that ὄχλοι πολλοί "is Matthew's idiom for a great crowd and is not to be understood of separate groups". This would therefore give an overall unity to the above expressions.

⁸⁵ See Kurt Aland mit H. Bachmann und W. A. Slaby, *Vollständige Konkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*, Band II *Spezialübersichten* hrsg. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1978) s.v., and Robert Morgenthaller, (*Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, 3. Aufl. (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag (1958), 1982) 127), has 49 38.41 respectively. The verse in question is probably 12:15 (πολλοί B pc lat / ὄχλοι K* / ὄχλοι πολλοί C D L W Θ f¹ 33, 892, 1006, 1342, 1506, π f h (q) sy^{p-h} sa^{ms}bo). Although B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971) 31, does not incline to the view, it is preferable to assume that ὄχλοι dropped out by homoteleuton than to regard it as a later addition. Metzger observes that the pressence of ὄχλος πολλοί at 4:25; 8:1; 13:2, 15:30 and 19:2 may have influenced the scribes, but his argument works both ways. Unlike Mark for instance, this would be the only place where Matthew refers to the crowds as πολλοί. Nor is the πολλοί here dependant on Mk (3:7 πολὺ πλῆθος). One might add that the reading of πολλοί at 12:15 runs counter to Matthew's tendency to identify his subject. As E. P. Sanders remarks, (*The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* [Cambridge: University Press, 1969] SNTSMS 9] 183) "Matthew is clearly the most specific Gospel in the category of making the subject of a sentence or clause explicit". For his criteria cf. 96, and for a list of such changes consult Frans Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: with a cumulative list*, BETL 37 (Leuven: University Press, 1974) 261-264.

The textual tradition of 8:18 is also diverse, but all the variant readings include ὄχλος(οι) (πολλοὺς, ὄχλους K² C L Θ f¹ 33, 892, 1006, 1342, 1506, π lat syr πολὺν ὄχλον (W pc g) W 1424 al sa^{ms}mae ὄχλους K* f¹ pc bo ὄχλον B sa^{ms}). For some reason Turner, *Style*, lists only 47 Stellen (43).

⁸⁶ Among "redactional insertions" I also include any of Mark's pronouns or impersonal verbs which Matthew has rendered by ὄχλος. This may appear overly cautious, but as Struthers Malbon ("Disciples", 108) finds, Mark is not always careful to distinguish between the various groups in his gospel. Hence some of these "insertions" may represent editorial decisions on the part of Matthew, and not merely his tendency to clarify Mark and to make it more explicit. An instance of such an editorial decision on Matthew's part can be seen in his triumphal entry account. Where Mark has πολλοί (11:8) and οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες (11:9 - are the disciples included? cf. 11:7). Matthew has ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὄχλος (21:8) and οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες (21:9) - the disciples are definitely not included. For a different list of insertions cf. Gundry, *Matthew* 646 who regards 31 Stellen as traditional, 17 as insertions and 1 as unique.

⁸⁷ R. H. Lightfoot, (*History*, 39 #1) argues that "it may be said with confidence that St. Mark never uses ὄχλος, in the plural. In 10:1, the only apparent exception, the singular should probably be read".

as christological. That is to say, it reflects Matthew's desire to make the crowds about Jesus as large and as significant as possible.⁸⁸ Yet it appears that he has not carried this out with any degree of rigour, as can be seen for example from Mt 15:30-39—a Matthean healing summary (29-31) combined with the feeding of the Four Thousand (32-39). Both 15:30 and 31 are insertions, 30 is plural and 31 singular. In the feeding account, Matthew seems to have shifted from the singular (15:32 Sing. // Mk 8:2 Sing.) to the plural (15:36 Pl. // Mk 8:6 Sing.) without there being any apparent distinction between them.

Minear has suggested that the singular demonstrates the incorporation of Markan material.⁸⁹ While this is in some degree true (9/17 vs. 10/23), it is hardly an instructive distinction. Recently T. J. Keegan has proposed a more far reaching *discrimen*. He maintains that "whenever Matthew uses the plural, he wants to designate the crowds in the technical sense as the object of Jesus' (and the disciples') ministry".⁹⁰ On the other hand, "every use of the singular is either found in traditional material and lacking special significance for Matthew or is used by Matthew in a clearly non-technical sense".⁹¹ One must question the legitimacy of Keegan's criteria here. If, as his sentence structure might imply, the occurrences lack special significance by virtue of being traditional material, his view must be gainsaid.⁹²

In addition, however, his distinction does not always hold. With respect to 15:30-39, 15:31 by his account ought to be a plural since it describes the crowds as the

⁸⁸ E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* MK hrsg. W. Schmauch, 4. Auf. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, (1956) 1967) 77 #1, "einer glorifizierende Tendenz".

⁸⁹ Minear, "Crowds", 29.

⁹⁰ Keegan, "Formulae", 425-426.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 426.

⁹² This view is also suggested by his note #47 (426); "other uses of the singular in Matthew are either clearly non-technical ... or appear in passages with Synoptic parallels ...", i.e., Keegan offers no third category. Against this see G. Stanton's balanced corrective: "To isolate changes Matthew makes to his sources and to concentrate our attention on them, as many redaction critics tend to do, is to do less than justice to Matthew. If we concentrate on the distinctive elements introduced by the evangelist we fail to appreciate that he frequently uses his traditions with little or no modification simply because he accepts them and wishes to preserve them and make them part of his portrait of Jesus and of his message to his own Christian community." In G. Stanton, "Origin", 1896. Even if this is not what Keegan means, "special significance for Matthew" is not the most objective of evaluations—special significance by what criteria? This in itself renders his findings rather limited.

object of Jesus' ministry. In Matthew however, it is singular.⁹³ The same might be said of 15:33 (insertion) where the crowd (sing.) is the ostensible object of the disciples' ministry.⁹⁴ Nor is his attempt to drive a wedge between the ὄχλοι πολλοί of 13:2a and the πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος of 13:2b at all convincing. Does only one of these mentions of the crowd refer to them as the object of Jesus' ministry?⁹⁵ In short, though it would have been a helpful distinction, Keegan is unable to support his position. It is best simply to conclude that Matthew intends no real distinction between the singular and the plural.

1b. *The Distinctiveness of ὄχλος*

The most distinctive element in Matthew's portrayal of the crowds is the term he uses - ὄχλος. In marked contradistinction to both Mark and Luke, it is the only word Matthew uses to characterize them.⁹⁶ Mark and Luke, for instance, both use πλῆθος to describe the crowds.⁹⁷ Mark also uses πολλοί of the crowds,⁹⁸ while

⁹³ In fairness to Keegan it ought to be noted that there are *varia lectiones* for this verse (τοὺς ὄχλους B L W 1006 1342 1506 π lat sy^{cp} mae / txt 8 D Δ θ f^{1.13} 33 579 700 892 1424 al) which he has apparently followed since he describes 15:31 as a plural ("Formulae" #49, 426). The singular is adopted by the third edition of *The Greek New Testament*, ed. K. Aland et al., 26 Auflage (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975) and Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979).

⁹⁴ Keegan describes this as a synoptic parallel ("Formulae" #47, 426) cf. Mk τούτους, yet strangely in #49, (426) he refers to "plurals which occur in passages with Synoptic parallels that lack *ochlos*". What of singular parallel passages—not least because Matthew has here changed Mark's plural τούτους into the singular ὄχλον τούτου.

⁹⁵ "The conclusion to be drawn from the plural and singular in Matthew 13:2a and 2b is not that there is no difference in meaning but that it is the occurrence in 13:2a and not in 13:2b that is of structural significance for Matthew", "Formulae" 426. He again discounts Matthew's inclusion of the Mk n // to 13:2b (4:2).

⁹⁶ This presupposes the correctness of the argument advanced above for the reading πολλοὶ ὄχλοι at 12:15.

⁹⁷ Mark 3:7,8; Luke 6:17 and 23:27. It is worth noting that Luke, unlike the other two synoptic gospels, sometimes uses ὄχλος or πλῆθος with a qualifying genitive. A good example of this is verse 6:17 καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ κτλ. (On πλῆθος see also: 13:27 crowds; 19:37 disciples; 23:1 elders of the people; 5:6 fish!) With respect to ὄχλος, while Luke does not use the word exclusively of the crowds, he does not use it with the genitive construction when he refers to them, and in this respect his usage conforms to that of Matthew or Mark. (On the genitive construction see Bauer *Worterbuch* s.v. #3.)

His use of πλῆθος is less consistent. On πλῆθος see J. Zmijewski, "πλῆθος" *EWNT* III cols. 245-249; G. Delling "πλῆθος κτλ" *TDNT* VI 274-283; and (in Luke) Paul Zingg, *Wachsen* 65-67. On ὄχλος in Luke see Minear "Luke" *passim* and Zingg, *Wachsen* 61-63.

⁹⁸ 6:33 cf. 34 and possibly at 11:8 (in conjunction with ἄλλοι). Minear "Audience" 81 also takes 2:15b as a reference to the crowd, as well as the πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ of 2:15a. In my view this stretches the crowd a bit too far. See C. H. Turner, "Notes" 239 who takes 2:15b to refer to the disciples.

Luke frequently uses λαός of them as well.⁹⁹ According to Minear, Luke changes Mark's ὄχλος to λαός some ten times,¹⁰⁰ and only uses Mark's ὄχλος nine times.¹⁰¹ Given this diversity on the part of the other two synoptic evangelists, Matthew's overall consistency is worthy of note.

Considering the fact that ὄχλος occurs fifty times in Matthew and thirty-eight times in Mark, one would anticipate that most of Mark's occurrences of the word would be found in Matthew. Surprisingly, this is not the case. Just over half of Mark's uses of the word, some twenty in all, have been omitted.¹⁰² Not all of these omissions are readily accounted for. Senior¹⁰³ has plausibly suggested that some are excluded because of the negative light they cast on the crowd—especially when "the crowds "crowd" Jesus".¹⁰⁴ He adds that two more may have been omitted on account of their reference to the idea of the Messianic Secret.¹⁰⁵

The above observations are probably correct, but to them one might append yet another—Matthew's tendency to stylize and simplify the actors in his gospel. This has been recognized with respect to the Jewish leaders,¹⁰⁶ and this stylization is very much

⁹⁹ It has been suggested, e.g. by J. Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*, StANT 3 (München: Kosel-Verlag, 1961) 101 #57 that λαός sometimes refers to the crowds in Matthew. This question will be taken up below.

¹⁰⁰ Luke 7:29; 8:47; 9:13; 19:48; 20:6; 20:19; 20:45; 23:13; 23:14.

¹⁰¹ Minear, "Luke" 86. He also detects some differences in nuance between ὄχλος and λαός (84, 87), though, as he observes, (82) Hans Conzelmann, *Mitte* 153 #1 gives three instances where [πᾶς ὁ] λαός is used interchangeably with ὄχλοι or ὄχλος (9:12)—7:29/7:24; 8:47/8:42; 9:13/9:12. For a discussion of Luke's use of λαός see Jerome Kodell, "Luke's Use of *Laos* 'People' especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19:28-24:53)" *CBQ* 31 (1969) 327-343.

¹⁰² 2:4; 2:13; 3:9; 3:20; 5:21; 5:24; 5:27; 5:30; 5:31; 7:17; 7:33; 8:1; 8:34; 9:15; 9:17; 9:25; 11:18; 12:41; 15:8; 15:15. Also compare Mt's "Pharisees" vs. Lk's "crowds" Mt 3:7/Lk 3:7; 12:24/11:14-15. Cf. R. Hummel, *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäus-Evangelium*, 2. Aufl., BevTh 33. (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1966) 12f..

¹⁰³ Donald Senior, *Passion*, 150 #2.

¹⁰⁴ The phrase is Struthers Malbon's, "Disciples" 120. Senior (*Passion* 150 #2) cites Mk 2:4; 3:9; 3:20; 5:21; 5:24; 5:31; 9:25 in this respect. Cf. Allen, *St. Matthew*, who observes that Matthew omits "especially statements of the thronging of the multitudes and the inconvenience caused by it" (xviii).

¹⁰⁵ Senior (*Passion*, 150#2) cites 7:17 and 7:33.

¹⁰⁶ This is so much the case that Kingsbury, (*Story*, 13, 17) has no qualms about treating the Jewish leaders, or the disciples for that matter, "as a single character". For a helpful list showing the changes Matthew has wrought in his depiction of the Jewish leaders, see Paul Winter, *On the Trial of Jesus*, 2nd ed. rev. and ed. T. A. Burkill and G. Vermes, SJ I (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972) 171-173. Particularly vivid is the frequency with which Matthew has introduced the Pharisees. Yet if Van Tilborg is correct about the simplification of the portrayal of the leaders in Matthew, this represents, quite literally, a nominal distinction. He concludes (*Leaders*, 6) that "Mt did not wish to create any distinction between the various groups." The Pharisees, Sadducees, scribes, high priests and elders "are all equally representations of the one Israel." (*Leaders*, 1). See too, Walker's remarks on the lack of

evident in his representation of the disciples as well. Not only are they in some measure idealized,¹⁰⁷ they are, like the Jewish leaders, endued by Matthew with various characteristic traits. Two of the most distinctive of such traits are ὀλιγοπιστία and understanding,¹⁰⁸ although as Zumstein has found, many of their other actions are also formalized.¹⁰⁹

The crowd in Matthew has undergone a similar treatment. C.H. Turner, for instance, has described Matthew's portrayal of the crowds as "vague" and

distinction Matthew makes between the Pharisees and Sadducees. For him, the expression "ist ein literarischer Begriff mit rein literarischer Funktion, der innerhalb des Evangeliums die Einheit des 'geschichtlichen' Israel darzustellen hat" (Rolf Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 16. Cf. Frankemölle, *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi*. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974, 92#42) who cites Walker with approval, and especially Hummel (*Auseinandersetzung*, 20 and his survey 12-22). Although he does not go so far as Walker he maintains that "*der Gegensatz zwischen Kirche und Judentum ist bei Matthäus so gross geworden, daß die Unterschiede innerhalb des letzteren nicht mehr scharf in den Blick kommen.*" (italics his).

The stylization can be seen in the above simplification; the Jewish leaders without exception form a monolithic whole opposed to Jesus, and are represented as such from the very outset (see Strecker, *Weg*, 139). Van Tilborg rightly sees in them an "antithesis" to Jesus' disciples (*Leaders* 170 cf. Strecker, *Weg* 140) as can be readily seen in Matthew's formalization of chapter 23. This stylization is further developed by Matthew's use of various recurring motifs so as to characterize the Jewish leaders, or more often, the Pharisees as the representatives of the Jewish leaders. In the first gospel, ὑποκριταί (15:7// Mk 7:6; 22:18; 23:13, (14); 15, 23, 25, 27, 29), τυφλοί (23:17, 19, 26) or τυφλοὶ ὁδηγοί (15:14; ~ 23:16, 23:24), πονηροί (12:34 cf. 9:4; 22:18 γενεά 12:39, 45; 16:4) have all, with the exception of 15:7 been introduced by Matthew. (For a more exhaustive examination of these words [as well as φονεῖς] see Van Tilborg's careful study, *Leaders* 27-72, and for an overview Kingsbury, *Story*, 17-23) These epithets, when conjoined with the leaders' antipathy (as expressed say, in the Matthean *Streitgespräche*), present a unique and highly stylized portrait of the Jewish leaders. For a transparent understanding of the Jewish leaders see below.

¹⁰⁷ On the idealization of the disciples see William Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in der Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Dritte, unveränderte Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, [1901] 1963) 157-160; Strecker, *Weg* 193f.; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund* 152f. and for a valuable corrective to Strecker, Luz, "Disciples," 101-102.

¹⁰⁸ On ὀλιγοπιστία cf. Mt 8:26; 14:31; 16:8; 17:20 and the Q passage Mt 6:30/Lk 12:28. See too Mt's use of διστάζω 14:31; 28:17, the only occurrences in the NT. For a detailed discussion see Gerhard Barth, "Glaube und Zweifel in den synoptischen Evangelien" *ZTK* 72 (1975) 269-292, 282-290; and "Matthew's Understanding of the Law" in G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H. J. Held, *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, NTL, tr. Percy Scott (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963) hereafter *TIM*, 58-164, 118-121 and "ὀλιγοπιστία κτλ" *EWNT* II col. 1237-38; Jean Zumstein, *La Condition du Croyant dans L'Évangile selon Matthieu* OBO 16 (Fribourg: Ed. Universitaires, 1977) 37-9.

On understanding see G. Barth, *TIM* 105-112, Georg Künzel, *Studien zum Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, CThM, (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1978) 140-143; H. Balz, "συνήμι" *EWNT* III cols. 734-36; H. Conzelmann, "συνήμι κτλ" *TDNT* 7, (888-96) 891-893; Strecker, *Weg*, 228-230; Zumstein, *Condition*, 41-42; Luz, "Disciples", 102-104.

¹⁰⁹ Zumstein, (*Condition*, 45) concludes his discussion of the disciples with the remark 'La tendance [est] de la description et la stylisation plutôt que l'historicisation' (45). He goes on to add: "Plus fondamentalement, à chaque forme littéraire correspond une fonction particulière des disciples. Dans les récits de controverses, ils sont accusés par la synagogue et défendus par Jésus. Dans les grands discours, ils sont les auditeurs privilégiés et compréhensifs du didascale eschatologique. Dans les débats d'école et les récits de miracles, c'est leur destinée comme telle qui est abordée. Mais au-delà de cette pluralité de perspectives, une constante se dessine". As will be seen in the course of the following analysis, the depiction of the crowds is not quite so highly refined.

"stereotyped".¹¹⁰ There is a certain measure of truth in this judgement—the crowds can be said to be vague because the Evangelist has omitted much of the concrete detail in Mark which palpably depicts the crowds *qua* crowds. In Matthew, virtually no reference is made to crowds forming (Mk 9:25) or gathering (Mk 2:2; 4:1; 5:21; 8:1; cf. Mt. 13:2). Details about the crowds hindering or crowding Jesus have also been removed: as in their preventing access to Jesus (Mk 2:4), potentially crushing him (3:9), preventing him from eating (3:20), milling about Jesus (5:24, 27, 30, 31). Matthew has also omitted references to individuals in the crowd speaking (9:17),¹¹¹ and excised a number of what might be described as "circumstantial" remarks made by the crowds in Mark (1:27; 9:26; 10:49).¹¹² The result is a much more homogenized portrayal, one largely devoid of distinctive individual details.¹¹³ The crowd has become more of a literary creation which speaks and acts as a whole. It has a certain choric function, and in this respect bears one or two affinities to the chorus in Greek Tragedy.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ C. H. Turner, "Notes", 227.

¹¹¹ Compare however Mt 12:47 which is textually suspect: εἶπεν δέ τις αὐτῷ Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἐστήκασιν ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι. vs. κ* B L 2542 pc ff¹ k sy^{sc} sa txt κ⁽¹⁾² c (D) W Z Θ f⁽¹⁾¹³ 33 892 1006 1342 (1506) π lat sy^{ph} mae bo, τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ κ¹ (892) pc (bo).

¹¹² Certainly most of the crowd's utterances in Matthew and Mark are 'circumstantial' in that they arise out of individual incidents. Mark's differ from Matthew's in that they are sporadic, unrelated, or possibly unflattering to Jesus (9:26). In the remarks Matthew has retained however, there is a certain continuity and probably development. This will be discussed in more detail below.

One further distinction between the crowd's direct discourse in Matthew and Mark is that in Mark it is rarely attributed *expressis verbis* to the ὄχλος: 1:27 ἅπαντες; 2:12 πάντας (cf. 2:4); 3:32 ὄχλος; 7:37 ἐξεπλήσσοντο (cf. 7:33), 9:26 τοὺς πολλούς (cf. 9:25); 10:49 πολλοί (10:48 cf. 10:46); 11:9-10 οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες; 15:13 οἱ; 15:14 οἱ (cf. 15:11 τὸν ὄχλον). Compare Matthew: 9:33 οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες; 12:23 πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον; 21:9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον λέγοντες; 21:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον. This is less clear in the passion account: 27:21 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν (cf. 27:20 τοὺς ὄχλους); 27:22 λέγουσιν πάντες; 27:23 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἔκραζον λέγοντες. Here the crowds are probably not mentioned explicitly both because it would be redundant, and because it would diminish the intensity of the narrative.

¹¹³ In this respect, for example, it is not possible to take the line of approach adopted by George Rudé (*The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England 1730-1848* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964) esp. 195-213) in which he is able to identify many of the constituent groups which make up a given crowd.

¹¹⁴ The "choral" character of the crowd's remarks has been noticed by Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, tr. Bertram Lee Woolf (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934) 53, 57, 71; Josef Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, Regensburger Neues Testament (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1965) 169, 174; Georg Strecker, *Die Bergpredigt: Ein Exegetischer Kommentar* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984) 27 "applaudierende chor". There are one or two affinities between the ὄχλοι and the choruses in the tragedies of Aeschylus or Sophocles. For one, the formalization: both groups speak, act and react as a whole, and even though they are comprised of many individuals they present a single recognizable *persona*. In addition, both have some degree of

It has also become in C. H. Turner's word more "stereotyped", or perhaps better, more "stylized".¹¹⁵ As with the description of the disciples or Jewish leaders, certain conventions or characteristic traits are imputed to the crowds. They follow Jesus (4:25; 8:1; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:19), they marvel (9:33; 15:31), they are astonished (7:28; 22:33), they are beside themselves (12:33); they are afraid (9:8); they glorify God (9:8; 15:31); consider John the Baptist a prophet (14:5; 21:26) and Jesus to be a prophet (21:11; 21:46) or the Son of David (12:23 (w. μήτι); 21:9). In addition they are feared by the leaders of Israel (14:5; 21:26; 21:46).¹¹⁶

These features prompt several observations. The first is that almost every one of these attributions is repeated over the course of the Gospel.¹¹⁷ The effect of this "conventionalization" is to give the crowds an overall consistency. Except in the passion narrative,¹¹⁸ they usually act in a consistent and predictable fashion. The crowds follow Jesus at 4:25 and still follow him at 20:29. The crowds are amazed at his teaching at 7:28 and amazed again at 22:33. The same can be said of the other features. Taken together they argue for a distinct role on the part of the crowds.

The distinctiveness of their role becomes even more apparent when it is recognized that many, if not most of the above attributions, are unique to the ὄχλοι—

interaction with the hero. Having said this, however, there are very considerable differences. Particularly in the tragedies of Aeschylus, the chorus was a major "actor" and was endowed with lines and actions far in excess of those of the ὄχλοι. Again, particularly in Aeschylus, but also in Sophocles, the chorus was characterized with a perception or insight that (as shall become apparent) was far more incisive than that seen in the crowds. Still, the comparison is instructive. On the chorus in Greek tragedy see N.G.L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930) s.v. "Tragedy" #14 and *passim*, and *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung hrsg. Georg Wissawa (Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag [1899] 1958) III, 2 s.v. "Chor" esp. cols. 2385, 2387. For an example of the literary analysis of fictional crowds, see David Lodge, "Crowds and Power in the early Victorian Novel" in *idem, After Bakhtin. Essays on Fiction and Criticism* (London: Routledge, 1990) 100-15.

¹¹⁵ By "stylize" both here and above I mean "to conventionalize", *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* (SOED) 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973) whereby Matthew represents and represents the groups in his gospel according to "conventions" ("method[s] of artistic treatment" - OED #9) which he himself provides.

¹¹⁶ The provenance of these particular verses will be considered in more detail later.

¹¹⁷ The exceptions are φοβέω at 9:8 and ἐξίστημι at 12:23. Yet even these verses relate closely to θαυμάζω and ἐκπλήσσω. On Matthew's penchant for repetition see Ernst von Döbschütz, "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist", in Stanton, *Interpretation* 19-29; 20-26, who sees in this phenomenon proof of Matthew's rabbinic and catechetical tendencies.

¹¹⁸ Minear ("Crowds" 35) has argued for a different crowd in the passion account. The inadequacy of this view will be demonstrated below.

at least in the form that these attributions are represented.¹¹⁹ In general, one would be able to identify them as the crowds merely from the traits that are ascribed to them. In this respect their treatment is in conformity with that which Matthew accords to the disciples or the Jewish leaders, even if it is more limited.¹²⁰ It is this array of features to which Kingsbury refers when he says that the crowds are 'flat' characters.¹²¹ How is it then, that Clifton Black can describe them as 'round' characters?¹²² Simply because he, quite rightly, places more emphasis on the fact that the crowds change. Mary Doyle Springer, upon whom he relies for his judgements on literary character, observes that usually only major characters change, while minor characters remain constant.¹²³ That the crowds change suggests that they have some of the 'roundness' associated with major characters, that is not found, for instance, in the depiction of the Jewish leaders.

But could it not be said that this represents a confusion of Matthew's literary presentation of the crowds with his historical presentation? It is obvious that his basic depiction of the crowds is determined by his tradition. Even if Matthew were not dependent on Mark, he could hardly have been unaware of the fact that the majority of

¹¹⁹ The two exceptions are θαυμάζω and ἐκπλήσσω. For the moment ἀκολουθέω and φοβέω will have to be bracketed, as will "Son of David" (though the children's use of Son of David in a non-appellative sense (21:15) may also make it an exception.) All three terms will be treated extensively below.

¹²⁰ The crowds differ from both of the aforementioned groups in that virtually all their actions and sayings are stereotyped—something that can hardly be said of the disciples especially, nor of the Jewish leaders. This is perhaps why Kingsbury is so ready to categorize them as 'flat' characters. See his *Story*, 23.

It is also worth noting that Matthew's conventionalization of the crowds falls somewhere midway between that of the leaders and that of the disciples. As was mentioned above, Matthew's characterization of the leaders is largely by epithet. This is occasionally expanded (as at 15:14) into actions, but this is less typical. On the other hand, the characterization of the disciples as ὀλιγόπιστοι, or as those with understanding is generally expressed in the gospel through a complex of events. The notion of ὀλιγοπιστία, for example, emerges out of entire episodes (the best examples being the Storm-Stilling and Walking-on the Water pericopae. On the former see Bornkamm's acclaimed essay "The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew", *TIM* 52-57, on the latter G. Barth "Glaube" 287-290), while as Luz has shown ("Disciples" 102-103) the theme of understanding is brought out through Jesus' teaching the disciples. That is to say, Matthew shows not only that the disciples understand, but how Jesus has brought them to understanding (cf. 16:5-12, 17:9-13). By comparison, the actions attributed to the crowds are far more simple. They are more like the epithets which describe the leaders—tags which immediately characterize the group under discussion. In this respect, the position of the crowds reflects their overall position in the Gospel somewhere between the disciples and the Jewish leaders.

¹²¹ Kingsbury, *Story*, 23-24.

¹²² Black, "Characterization", 619.

¹²³ Mary Doyle Springer, *A Rhetoric of Literary Character*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978) 14, cf. 11-44.

Jews had not become Christians, despite the popularity of Jesus. Since the tradition, and, therefore, the actions of the crowds were already predetermined, how can the crowds' depiction properly be construed as a literary one?

While there is no denying the historical substrate in Matthew's presentation of the crowds, it is not clear that it has, in every case, determined how Matthew characterizes the crowds.¹²⁴ Certainly, the crowds' great *volte-face* and betrayal of Jesus is presupposed by Matthew, yet like Mark he does not even comment on it. The crowds are warned about their leaders at 23:1 (// Mk 12:37b), and in the next reference to them at 26:47 (// Mk 14:33)¹²⁵ they have come with Judas to arrest Jesus. Matthew, like Mark before him, appears to treat this change on the part of the crowds as one that does not really require an explanation, simply because it is already an historical datum.

The very clarity of this portrayal illumines one instance where ὄχλος does not refer to the crowds *per se*, but to another distinct group mentioned in the pericope of the Ruler's Daughter (9:18-26)—καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον θορυβούμενον (9:23). Several factors prompt this observation. First, the crowds as such normally follow Jesus. In this instance, the crowd which is mentioned is already there. Second, the ὄχλος is conjoined specifically with flute players, which makes it appear as if they are a special group.¹²⁶ Finally, in this account Matthew has excised three of Mark's references to the crowds (5:24, 27, 31) so that only Jesus and his disciples follow the leader (9:19).¹²⁷ All this makes it clear that Matthew has deliberately distinguished the two groups.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ A related example from Greek tragedy might be helpful here. Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides all wrote plays about Electra and her brother Orestes. The plot of each play is very similar, as the story is based on an established mythical tradition originating with Homer. The differences in the plays occur largely in the characterization, and, interestingly, in how each playwright reacts to the work of his predecessor(s).

¹²⁵ Mark has one intervening reference to the crowd at 12:41 in the pericope of the widow's offering, a pericope omitted by Matthew.

¹²⁶ William G. Thompson, "Reflections on the Composition of Mt 8:1-9:34", *CBQ* 33 (1971) 365-388, 386 #52; Gundry, *Matthew*, 175; Dennis C. Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic", *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 392-410, 400 #6.

¹²⁷ Thompson, "Reflections" 386#52. Also noteworthy is Matthew's consistent designation of the group in the singular 9:23, 25, no parallels.

¹²⁸ If this argument is valid it would help to further unify Matthew's conception. Lohmeyer says of the crowd that "Die Zahl der ὄχλος kann so groß sein, daß Jesus sich vor ihnen in ein Boot rettet (13:3) oder so klein wie die Schar die Klagefrauen bei einem Todesfall." *Matthäus* 77 #1. With this incident removed the ὄχλοι appear as a more uniformly large group. The smallest group Matthew

Conclusion

To sum up, uniformity and stylization are the key features of Matthew's portrayal of the crowd. In comparison with Mark and Luke, Matthew has unified the conception. Eschewing other words, he uses only ὄχλος (singular or plural indifferently) to refer to the crowd. This uniformity has been further emphasized and complemented by his stylizing of the crowds' characteristics. This has allowed them to emerge as a distinct and definite group within the fabric of his gospel, analagous in some ways to the disciples and Jewish leaders. In short, he has both clarified and simplified the image of the crowd.

2. THE ETHNIC CHARACTER OF THE CROWDS

The question of the ethnic composition of the ὄχλοι is not readily answered. It is certainly evident from passages like 4:25 and 9:33 that at least some of the crowds are Jewish.¹²⁹ What is disputed is whether it also contained, in Matthew's eyes, a significant proportion of Gentiles. There are several passages which might lend themselves to such an interpretation.

Matthew's remark about how Jesus' fame ἀπῆλθεν ... εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν (4:24) might be interpreted in such a light.¹³⁰ What Matthew means by his reference to Syria has long been debated. If it refers to a limited area in immediate propinquity to Israel, the Gentile population would be far less significant than if it refers to the Roman province of Syria.

Lagrange, among others,¹³¹ favours the first of these alternatives. He argues

describes then is a houseful of the ὄχλοι (12:46, cf. 13:1) and after that the crowds in the temple (26:55; 22:33; 21:26). Otherwise one gets the impression of large groups, especially in the Feeding Accounts.

¹²⁹ Donaldson, *Mountain*, 255 #50 takes the reference to οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν at 7:29 as evidence of the Jewish character of the crowd. This is true, but the gospel also gives indications of gentiles figuring amongst the crowds. What is required in this examination, therefore, is not simply an enumeration of the various passages, but an explanation of Matthew's underlying rationale. This is undertaken below.

¹³⁰ This phrase is found only in Matthew, and Syria is only mentioned here in his gospel.

¹³¹ M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1923) 72; Alan H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, (London: Macmillan, 1915) 47; E. Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium* 4. Auflage HNT 4 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, (1927), 1971)

that the word is used in "un sens juif pour signifier un pays qui n'était pas le pays d'Israël, sans être très éloigné" suggesting "les régions au sud de l'Herman".¹³² To substantiate this view he appeals to the Mishnah,¹³³ while others, Lagrange excepted, have interpreted a passage in Josephus the same way.¹³⁴

On the other hand, many take Syria to refer, as it usually does in the New Testament (cf. Lk 2:2; Gal. 1:21; Acts 15:23; 15:41; 18:18), to the Roman province of Syria.¹³⁵ Needless to say, this area was largely gentile, although the major cities had significant Jewish populations.¹³⁶ Yet even if, as seems likely, this position is to be preferred, it does not necessarily suggest that Jesus ever entered Syria. Verse 24 only refers to the fame of Jesus (ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ).¹³⁷ Nor does this necessarily imply that

32; J. Schmid, *Matthäus 73*; Bonnard, *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*, CNT I (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963) 52; Alexander Sand, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, RNT (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1986) 87.

¹³² Lagrange, *Matthieu*, 72.

¹³³ Lagrange, 72 refers to Abodah Zarah 1:8. Part of the passage runs: "None may hire houses to them [sc. Gentiles] in the land of Israel or, needless to say, fields; in Syria houses may be hired to them but not fields; while outside the land houses may be sold and fields, hired to them." This is the view of R. Judah while R. Jose opines, "... and in Syria houses may be sold and fields hired to them ...". For further references in the Mishnah pertaining to Syria see W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge: University Press, 1964) (hereafter *SSM*) 327 #3.

¹³⁴ Notably McNeile, Klostermann and Schmid as in note 52 above. The passage from Josephus is *De bello Judaico* 7:3:3: "The Jewish race, ... is particularly numerous in Syria, where intermingling is due to the proximity of the two countries."

¹³⁵ Among others H. Balz, 'Συρία' *EWNT* III cols. 746-7; W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch s.v.*; Beare *Matthew* 124; Davies, *SSM*, 327, Donaldson, *Mountain*, 254 #42; Floyd Filson, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, BNTC (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960) 74; Gaechter, *Matthäus*, 135; J. Gnllka, *Das Matthäusevangelium* I Teil HTKNT (Freiburg: Herder, 1986) 108; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 153; Gundry, *Matthew*, 153; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 206 #16; Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthäus: seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbstständigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1957) 123; J. Schneiwind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* NTD 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956) 36; Trilling, *Wahre* 135; B. Weiss, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium*, 9 Auf. MK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, (1883)1898) 86.

¹³⁶ Leonhard Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im erstem und zweitem Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche* BFChTh 2 Reihe 55 (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954) 176f. On the background and geography of the province see Balz 'Συρία' cols. 746,7. Worth noting at this point is that Matthew's mention of Syria, and its resident urban Jewish population have made it commonplace to regard Syria as the area where Matthew's gospel originated: "Die meisten Forscher vermuten ... daß das Mt in Antiochia oder allgemein in Syrien geschrieben sei". W.G. Kümmel, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 17. Auflage (Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1973) 90. J. Meier has recently made a particularly strong case for Antioch in R. E. Brown and J. P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983) 18-27. For other views which have also appeared recently see: H. Dixon Slingerland, "The Transjordanian Origin of St. Matthew's Gospel" *JSNT* 3 (1979) 18-28 and B.T. Viviano, "Where was the Gospel According to St. Matthew Written?" *CBQ* 41 (1979) 533-46. If the above surmise is correct, the reference to Syria may well be a signature (analogous to 13:52) and would thus explain its inclusion at 4:24 (though one might have expected them to have "followed" Jesus as at 4:25).

¹³⁷ This is the position of Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 108 and Heinrich Kasting, *Die Anfänge der Urchristlichen Mission: Eine historische Untersuchung* BevTh 55 (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1969) 112.

non-Jewish crowds came from Syria,¹³⁸ although this could be inferred by the impersonal προσήνεγκαν (24b), depending on how closely one connects the two sentences. In short, the reference to Syria leaves the possibility of gentile crowds open, and not much more.

The reference to the Decapolis at 4:25 is perhaps a little clearer: καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ... Δεκαπόλεως κτλ.¹³⁹ The Decapolis was a group of Greek cities situated roughly south and east of Galilee. Concerning the cities making up the region Pliny observes that "not all writers, keep to the same towns in the list; most however include Damascus ... Philadelphia, Raphana ... Scythopolis ... Gadara ... Hippo ... Dion, Pella ... Galasa, Canatha".¹⁴⁰ Though these cities did have strong Jewish minorities, their populace was predominantly pagan.¹⁴¹ This could certainly suggest a composite crowd. What is more, Matthew indicates that they followed Jesus (4:25). Here then it is quite possible that Matthew includes gentiles among the crowds.¹⁴²

A further passage which might suggest a gentile ὄχλοι is 15:31 where the crowds glorify the "God of Israel".¹⁴³ Many see this expression as pointing to a gentile audience,¹⁴⁴ not least because Jesus has just finished healing the daughter of a

¹³⁸ Donaldson, *Mountain*, 114 and Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 206 #13 for instance, both regard the crowds as Jewish.

¹³⁹ This is the only reference to the Decapolis in Matthew. Schille, "Δεκαπόλις" *EWNT* I cols. 681-2, is right in regarding it as dependent on Mk. 3:8, yet this does not in itself explain why Matthew has retained it, since he has otherwise omitted Mark's references to Tyre, Sidon and Idumea.

¹⁴⁰ *Pliny Natural History* V:74 Josephus is apparently one of those authors not keeping to the list since he implicitly excludes Damascus in describing Scythopolis as the largest city of Decapolis (*BJ* III 446). For a detailed analysis of each of these cities see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)* Rev.; ed. G. Vermes et al. Vol. II (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979) 127-154. See too D. C. Pellett, 'Decapolis' *IDB* I s.v. and S. Thomas Parker, "The Decapolis Reviewed", *JBL* 94 (1975) 437-441.

¹⁴¹ Schürer, *History*, II 159.

¹⁴² Trilling, *Wahre* 135 holds that this possibility cannot be categorically denied. See, however, the intriguing argument by Lohfink ("Bergpredigt", 273-76), who argues "offenbar geht es Matthäus gar nicht so sehr um die gegenwärtige Verteilung der Bevölkerung, sondern um das Israel der Väter" (275). So too, Heinz Giesen, "Jesu Krankenheilungen im Verständnis des Matthäusevangeliums" in Ludger Schenke (ed.), *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*, (Stuttgart: KBW, 1988), 79-106, 92-97. This view has much to commend it.

¹⁴³ The phrase is found only in the first gospel. Compare Mark's healing account 7:31-37.

¹⁴⁴ Among others: Beare, *Matthew*, "perhaps" 346; J. C. Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, 257; P. Gaechter, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium: Ein Kommentar*, (Innsbruck: Tyrolia Verlag, 1963) 505; Gundry, *Matthew*, 319; David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, NCB (London: Oliphants, 1972) 255; Klostermann, *Matthäus*, 258; McNeile, *Matthew*, 232-233; Schmid, *Matthäus*, 241; Schniewind, *Matthäus*, 185. See too, Joachim Jeremias, *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker*, 2. Auf. (Stuttgart: W.

Canaanite (15:21-28), and may still be in gentile territory.¹⁴⁵ These arguments, however, are not as weighty as they appear. The expression "God of Israel" occurs not infrequently in the Psalms and may simply reflect Matthew's penchant for formal language.¹⁴⁶ Moreover, Matthew's presentation of Jesus' geographical itinerary is so vague it cannot really be said to point definitely to either gentile or Jewish territory.¹⁴⁷ As to the healing of the Canaanite's daughter, it can just as readily be argued that her healing was exceptional (15:24) and a product of her faith (15:28).¹⁴⁸ Hence it has to be said that this passage does not allow for a definite solution either way.

As the examination of the above passages has not presented any decisive answers, the question might productively be approached from a different position. One promising avenue would be to consider the remarks Jesus makes in the first gospel about his ministry and that of his disciples. If a consistent position emerges one would be able to decide if the crowds, nominally at least, were regarded as mixed or Jewish.

A quick overview reveals that, from a narrative standpoint at least, an apparently consistent picture does emerge. At 10:5f. Jesus adjures his disciples—Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαριτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. Later in the account of the healing of the Canaanite's daughter, Jesus makes a similar remark about his own mission (15:24)—οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ. The charge to the disciples, however, is apparently superseded in the Final

Kohlhammer Verlag, 1956) 29 and Davies, *SSM* quoting Bacon "probably" 328. Further references in Donaldson, *Mountain*, #42, pp. 261-262.

¹⁴⁵ The ἦλθεν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας (15:29) could suggest the eastern, gentile side of the Sea of Galilee.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. the *Chorschluß* at 9:33 and Trilling's remarks *Wahre*, 133. Donaldson cites Psalms 41:13; 59:5; 68:35; 69:6; 72:18; 106:48 (*Mountain* 261-262 #42) and Sand, *Matthäus*, 317 adduces Is. 29:23.

¹⁴⁷ The phrase cited in note 145 above could apply equally well to the Jewish side of the Sea of Galilee. The vague use of μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν at 11:1 and 12:9 would seem to support Trilling's contention that "der Evangelist ein geringes Interesse an geographischen Einzelheiten hat" (*Wahre*, 131), as does the fact that Donaldson can argue that Jesus' itinerary has been refashioned (against Mark) so that Jesus actually avoids gentile territory! Donaldson, *Mountain*, #42, pp. 261-262. Others who consider Jesus to be in Jewish territory include Bonnard, *Matthieu*, 234; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 378; Lagrange, *Matthieu*, 311; Alfred Plummer, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (London: Elliot Stock, 1909) 218, and implicitly, Thomas J. Ryan, "Matthew 15:29-31: An Overlooked Summary" *Horizons* 5 (1978) 31-42. For the possible origin of 10:6 see Polag, *Fragmenta Q: Texthefte zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1979) 45 #20.

¹⁴⁸ Giesen, "Krankenheilungen", 96-7.

Commission. Here they are commanded by the Risen Jesus (28:19)—πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν.¹⁴⁹

One gets the impression from the directives that two different phases of ministry are being described—one that depicts the earthly ministry of Jesus and his disciples, and one the ministry of the disciples after Jesus' resurrection.

¹⁴⁹ All of these passages are unique to Matthew. On the framework of 10:5f. see the careful discussion by M. D. Hooker, "Uncomfortable Words: X. Prohibition of Foreign Missions (Mt 10:5-6)" *ET* 82 (1971) (361-365) 361-362; on 15:24 see: T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM [1937] 1964) 200-201 and Kilpatrick, *Origins* 50; on 28:19, the extensive works by J. Lange, *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Matthäus: Eine traditions- und redaktions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mt 28, 16-20* FzB 11 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973), Benjamin J. Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20*, SBLDS 19 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) and Jane Schaberg, *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit: The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b*, SBLDS 61 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982) *passim*.

Not surprisingly, there is a broad spectrum of opinion concerning the origins of the first two passages especially. A number of scholars regard one, or both, as dominical utterances. Jeremias has given considerable support to this view in his claim to have found traces of Aramaic underlying the Greek; cf. *Verheissung* 16-17, 22-23. Others who support this view include G. Bornkamm, "Christus und die Welt in der urchristlichen Botschaft" in *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien*, (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1952) 157-172 (159) (cf. 10:5f.); David Bosch, *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftsschau Jesu* ATANT 36, (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1959) 84-86; W. G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung: Untersuchungen zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu*, 3. Auf. ATANT (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1956) 77-78 (15:24 secondary to 10:6) and with reservations—Wilfred Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* Vol. II, *St. Luke and St. Matthew*, ed. H. Chadwick (Cambridge: University Press, 1957) 51 and T. W. Manson, *Sayings* 201.

Others situate these passages in the context of early Palestinian Jewish Christianity, where these passages arose out of the whole discussion of whether a gentile mission should be countenanced or not. Bultmann, (*HST* 38,155) is the classic propounder of this view. See in addition Ferdinand Hahn, *Der Verständnis der Mission im neuen Testament*, 2. Auf. WMANT 13 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1965) 44; Martin Hengel, "Die Ursprünge der christlichen Mission" *NTS* 18 (1971) 15-38, 36.

A third group of opinion holds that these passages were composed by Matthew himself. Kasting, *Mission*, 110 for instance, argues that Jeremias' alleged Aramaicisms can be explained just as well in light of Septuagintal Greek. Graham Stanton has, in addition, lately pointed out the Matthean characteristics of these verses, arguing that they represent Matthew's "creative interpretation" of Mark. (G. Stanton, "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus" in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*, hrsg. P. Stuhlmacher WUNT 28 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983) (273-287) (276-277). See in addition Frankemölle, *Jahwebund* 137-138, and F. W. Beare, "The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: Matthew 10 and Parallels" *JBL* 89 (1970) (1-13) 9. (Hooker, "Prohibition", notes that this represents a change from a previous position where he regarded these sayings as traditional 363 #3.)

Of these alternatives the last appears the most promising. Reasons for dismissing the second alternative will be given below. As to the first, one has to ask why so many Mattheanisms occur in the reputed *ipsissima vox Jesu*. Acceptance of the last position explains them, and moreover, does not necessarily preclude an underlying awareness of tradition on Matthew's part. As Dodd has observed (C.H. Dodd, *History and the Gospel*, rev. ed., (London: Hodder and Stoughton, (1938), 1964, 131) whether or not the remarks go back to Jesus, they certainly conformed to his practice. Verses 10:5f and 15:24 might well reflect Matthew's knowledge of this tradition, and his conscious integration of it into his gospel. See too, Davies, *SSM* 330, though he rejects the invention of these passages by Matthew.

Yet do the crowds come within the purview of these directives? Matthew suggests that they do. This is clear from his description of the crowds at 9:36 (11 Mk 6:34) as πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα, an ascription that relates thematically with τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.¹⁵⁰ It is true, of course, that all these passages could be unrelated traditional λόγια that Matthew has merely passed on. What makes it clear that this is not the case is the fact that he has expressly related them at 9:36 and 10:5. He has removed 9:36 from its Markan sequence (after the mission and immediately prior to the feeding of the five thousand) and placed it immediately before the summoning of the Twelve and the mission account (10:1ff.).¹⁵¹ The first command the disciples receive after they have been summoned (10:1-4) is to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (10:5ff.).¹⁵² The connection can hardly be fortuitous, and suggests that even if the verses are traditional, Matthew intended them to inform

¹⁵⁰ On πρόβατα in Matthew cf. H. Preisker/S. Schulz "πρόβατον κτλ" *TDNT* VI 689-692; G.H. Friedrich, "πρόβατον" *EWNT* III cols. 365-68; Francis Martin, "The Image of the Shepherd in the Gospel of Saint [sic] Matthew", *Science et Esprit* 27 (1975) 261-301; and Wilfred Tooley, "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus: *NovT* 7 (1964-65) 15-25. Missing in these accounts, particularly in the last ("there are only six 'shepherd sayings' in this gospel apart [sic] from two parables using the imagery" 19) is an explanation for the profuseness of the image in the First Gospel. Aland (*Spezialübersichten*, 230) lists: Mt 11 Mk 2 Lk 2 Jn 19. That Matthew is closer to John than to either Mark or Luke is highly significant, and Minear (*Images of the Church in the New Testament* [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960] 84ff.) is certainly correct when he identifies both christological and covenantal themes here.

With respect to οἴκου Ἰσραήλ, Jeremias (*Verheissung* 23 #89) rightly argues that it is not a partitive genitive but an exegetical one referring to all of Israel. So too, Poul Nepper-Christensen (*Das Matthäusevangelium: Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?* ATD I (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget 1, 1958) 181f.) who correctly argues against Cullmann (*Petrus: Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer: Das historische und das theologische Petrusproblem* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1952) 213) that "Nichts deutet hierin an, daß eine näher begrenzte Gruppe gemeint ist, sondern der ganze Zusammenhang legt uns die Annahme nahe, daß es sich hier um eine allgemeine Kennzeichnung Israels handelt" (cf. 9:36; 181-181). Though there is an implicit condemnation of the leaders here (Tooley, "Shepherd" 20) the leaders of the people are no less lost - cf. Mt. 15:14 (M).

¹⁵¹ The need of the crowd (which Matthew had intensified by the inclusion of ἐσकुλμένοι καὶ ἐρριμμένοι) is further emphasized in the passage's conjunction with the "Great Harvest" λόγιον (9:37-8). Matthew has taken the passage from Q (// Lk 10:2f., so D. Lüthmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, WMANT 33, (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969) 59f.) so that here the urgent need of ἐργάται is (unlike Luke) expressly related to the crowds. Matthew does follow Luke's sequence in placing this pericope just before the Mission Charge, and thus uses the passage as a rationale for the mission (Lüthmann, *Redaktion*, 60).

¹⁵² The placement of the pericope here by Matthew can be presupposed, both if it is regarded as an isolated saying, or if it is considered Matthean. Even if, as Schürmann (Heinz Schürmann, "Mt 10, 5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes" in *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien: Beiträge* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1967) (137-149) 148) maintains, 10:5b-6 functioned as the introduction to Luke 10:8-11f (which seems less likely than the above positions), this would still not fundamentally affect the above correlation since Matthew's activity is sufficiently evident with respect to 9:36. Naturally, if Matthew created 10:5b, as is suggested above, then he is responsible for the placement of both 9:36 and 10:5f..

each other. This leads to the tentative conclusion that Matthew regards the ministry of Jesus and his disciples as one that is aimed at Israel, and therefore at Jewish crowds.¹⁵³

It must be stressed, however, that such a conclusion is highly tentative, since it depends on a narrative reading of 10:5f.; 15:24 and 28:19. That is to say, it suggests different phases of Jesus' and the disciples' ministry—one to the Jews and one to the nations. Yet this reading of the verses could be entirely fortuitous, and if it is, the above judgement about the crowds' ethnic character need not necessarily apply. And the problem with a narrative approach is that it cannot tell us any more, since it is bound to the nominal time-frame of the Gospel. For this reason our analysis will have to be expanded so that it can consider the significance of these verses within Matthew's community.¹⁵⁴

2a. *Particularism and Universalism in Matthew's Community*

In general, the tension between 10:5f. and 15:24 on the one hand, and 28:19 on the other, has been explained in two ways. One solution has been to attribute the opposing views to opposing groups or traditions within Matthew's Church. The other has been to reconcile the antithetical positions within the context of *Heilsgeschichte*.¹⁵⁵

The influential essay by Ernst Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology", takes the first approach.¹⁵⁶ He argues that the particularist tendencies in Matthew represent the stance of the Jewish Christians. This group had restricted its mission to the house of Israel, secure in the knowledge that their success would hasten the eschatological ingathering of the gentiles on Mount Zion. They resisted the gentile

¹⁵³ The ὄχλοι and οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ are not to be equated. Nor does this identification absolutely preclude the presence of gentiles among the ὄχλοι. It simply indicates that the avowed intention of Jesus and his disciples is to go only to Jews (exceptions 8:5-13; 15:21-28 notwithstanding), and thus it might be reasonably expected that the ὄχλοι would normally be comprised of Jews.

¹⁵⁴ This will furnish the "rationale" mentioned above. On the limitations of narrative reading see Daniel Patte's remarks (*The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 200 #12).

¹⁵⁵ Trilling presents three slightly different alternatives in *Wahre* 101-102. As should become apparent, these above two solutions are at variance with each other in their approach. The first sets out to explain the situation of the community, the second, the product of the community—the Gospel.

¹⁵⁶ E. Käsemann, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology" in *New Testament Questions of Today*, tr. W. J. Montague (London: SCM, 1969) 82-107.

mission because any attempt to convert the gentiles before the end-time would be "an arrogant invasion of a right God has reserved for himself".¹⁵⁷ The universalist position, by contrast, was advocated by the hellenizing enthusiasts. They concluded that their spiritual endowments marked the advent of the end-time and indicated that God had thereby begun the gentile mission.

The difficulty with this reconstruction is that it explains the divergent views well enough, but not Matthew's inclusion of both. Why would he include two such divergent—and apparently normative—views in one gospel? Given the opposition between the two it would be strange to find an adherent of either position giving such prominence—and authority—to the view of his opponent. As Schuyler Brown succinctly remarks, "Such an explanation ... is ... quite incredible".¹⁵⁸

In a triad of essays,¹⁵⁹ Brown has made his own attempt to characterize Matthew's community. Like Käsemann, he attributes the particularist and universalist elements to different groups, but also to different historical situations. The particularist standpoint is the view that prevailed in the Jewish Christian community in Palestine prior to the Jewish War. The community engaged only in a mission to Jews, though it did recognize the existence of a separate mission to the gentiles.¹⁶⁰ This situation changed markedly after the war when the community was forced into a gentile milieu, and more importantly, began to experience increasing persecution from post-war Pharisaism.¹⁶¹

It was this change of circumstances that led to the incorporation of universalist features into the community, and ultimately into the gospel. The editor had universalist

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹⁵⁸ Schuyler Brown, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel" *ST* 31 (1977) 21-32, 21. Trilling is equally emphatic, "Es ist undenkbar, daß der Evangelist seiner Kirche zwei ganz verschiedene Missionsweisungen mit gleicher Verbindlichkeit vorlegt.", *Wahre* 102.

¹⁵⁹ In addition to the essay cited above, see "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section (Mt 9:35-11:1)", *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73-90 and "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission", *NT* 22 (1980) 193-221.

¹⁶⁰ Brown "Community", 208, 212, 214, 221 and "Mission" 89-90. Brown sees a reference to a separate Gentile mission at 10:18; "the phrase εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (v.18) implies a *separate* mission for Jews and Gentiles, and as far as the Central Section is concerned, the responsibility of Matthew's community is strictly limited to the former" (90).

¹⁶¹ "Community", 214-217.

persuasions, but was keenly aware of the division in his community. The mission charge at the end of the gospel represents his attempt to move the particularist element of his community to an acceptance of one, universal, mission.¹⁶² He does this by first presenting the particularist position in the "central section" (9:35-11:1)¹⁶³ and then moving to a *deus ex machina* presentation of the universalist position at the gospel's very end.¹⁶⁴ Though somewhat contradictory,¹⁶⁵ Matthew intended his presentation of both points of view to bring about an acceptance of one universal mission, and thereby to bring about a healing of the rift in his community.¹⁶⁶

Brown's position is well articulated and carefully worked out. Nonetheless, it fails to take cognizance of several decisive features. One of these is the gentile component of the gospel. Brown at one point maintains that Matthew's editorial and redactional activity is responsible for the "re-judaizing" of Mark's Gospel.¹⁶⁷ Yet he fails to treat the gentile features of the first gospel. He does touch on passages which he sees as relating to the gentile mission (such as 2:1-13 and 8:5-13) but claims "these episodes can only have a subsidiary role, since they occur before the subject of the mission has been explicitly raised."¹⁶⁸ These features, and those he does not mention, can hardly be described as subsidiary. As Davies observes, the entire gospel is "set by Matthew within a framework which suggests not 'particularism' but 'universalism'". He goes on to add that "there is no justification for regarding these last [sc. the

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 217-218, 221.

¹⁶³ Like Hahn ("Denn zu deutlich ist in c.10 die historische Situation transparent gemacht für die Mission der Jünger in der Zeit nach Jesu Auferstehung, wie ja alle großen Reden des Evangelium unmittelbar der Gemeinde gelten" *Mission* 108), Brown regards the entire "Central Section" as transparent. What is more, he claims that the entire section must also be regarded as particularist. Not only are there no explicit references to the gentile mission, but the mission to Israel is left open-ended—a fact which illustrates that it was still going on. See "Mission" 90 and *passim*, and "Two-fold" 29.

¹⁶⁴ "Two-fold" 29-32, and "Community" 217-218, 221.

¹⁶⁵ "The evangelist's own peacemaking intention is reflected in the fact that he preferred to accept a contradiction rather than polemicize against the position with which he disagreed." "Two-fold" 30 #32.

¹⁶⁶ "Community" 217-218 and "Two-fold" 31.

¹⁶⁷ "Two-fold" 26-28. He states that "the same 're-judaizing' effect that results from the insertion of special Matthean tradition is achieved elsewhere by Matthew's own redactional work" (26). He lists a number of these features pp. 26-28, and sees, in addition, the same redactional work in Q material (27) and Matthew's own special tradition (28).

¹⁶⁸ "Two-fold" 31 cf. "Community"; "all references to the gentile mission prior to the climactic scene are in the form of indirect or veiled allusions" (218).

'universalist' utterances] as less representative of Matthew and his Church than the former" [the particularist point of view].¹⁶⁹ Can Brown therefore rightly describe them as subsidiary? They would hardly seem so to a community that would be especially sensitive to them.¹⁷⁰

Brown is also faced with the related issue of the provenance of the gospel's gentile features. If, as he maintains, Matthew was deliberately "re-judaizing" his sources, where did the gentile elements¹⁷¹ originate, and why were they included? Brown is forced into the dubious position of having Matthew re-judaize" with one hand and "de-judaize" with the other—a position many would find insupportable.¹⁷²

His analysis also founders on the question of transparency. He rightly notes how each of the disciples' actions in the "Central Section" is intentionally made to correspond to actions of Jesus.¹⁷³ One such action however is conspicuously absent. While Jesus himself teaches in the "Central Section" (9:35; 11:1) he does not enjoin the disciples (and hence the community) to teach (διδάσκω) until 28:19.¹⁷⁴ If this discourse is to be taken as a mission directive in its own right for the disciples and the community, how is it that the vital teaching function is not granted them? This

¹⁶⁹ SSM 327. Cf. Kümmel's remarks: "die Haltung des Matthäus keinesweges partikularistisch ist ... Matthäus vielmehr die Botschaft Jesu allen Völkern gilt". *Einleitung* 86 and the list of passages supporting his contention.

¹⁷⁰ Brown's argument is rendered even more suspect by the pervasiveness of the gentile features, and more significantly, the extent to which they are rooted in the Gospel. Far from being simply a veneer readily separable from the underlying observant Jewish-Christian material, the gentile orientation permeates the gospel. It figures in, among other things, the *Reflexionszitate* (12:18/21; 4:15), the parables (13:38, 21:43, 25:32), the apocalyptic discourse (24:14), healings (15:28), the crucifixion account (27:54), as well as the gospel's opening verse (1:1). For additional passages cf. Davies, SSM 327-329 and Kümmel, *Einleitung* 86.

¹⁷¹ On gentile elements in Matthew see K. W. Clark, "The Gentile Bias in Matthew" *JBL* 66 (1947) 165-172 (also in *The Gentile Bias and other Essays* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980) 1-8), Gabriel Hebert, "The Problem of the Gospel According to Matthew" *SJT* 14 (1961) 403-413 esp. 406-407 and G. Strecker, *Weg* 15-35 and P. Nepper-Christensen, *Das Matthäusevangelium, passim*. On Matthew's alleged ignorance of some Jewish practices see Meier, *Law* 16-21 and Lloyd Gaston, "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles: The Setting of Matthew's Christology" *Int* 29 (1975) 24-40, 34 (also in *Interpreting the Gospels*, ed. J. L. Mays [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981] 78-96) 88-89 #27. If it is urged that these elements have been added so as to "acclimatize" the community, why at the same time is Matthew re-judaizing his sources?

¹⁷² Abel for instance cites J. P. Brown in saying that such an editor would be "a monster, at once the most pro-Jewish and pro-Gentile of the Evangelists" in E. Abel, "Who Wrote Matthew" *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 138-152, 142. Abel himself argues for two editors, one Jewish and one gentile.

¹⁷³ "Mission" 78-79 and cf. Gnlika, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 360.

¹⁷⁴ J. Meier, *Law*, 28 #9 and the related article by Meier, "Salvation-History in Matthew: In search of a Starting Point" *CBQ* 37 (1975) 203-215, 204-205 and note 4.

omission, of itself, makes it doubtful whether the "Central Section" can in fact be regarded as a separate injunction within the particularist community.¹⁷⁵ Instead, its subordination to 28:19 indicates that it has to be interpreted in light of the Great Commission.

For this reason and those cited above, Brown's analysis must be considered inadequate. This is not to suggest that Matthew's community has not been influenced at one point by factors such as he delineates,¹⁷⁶ but this would appear to have been in a time largely past. The very abundance of gentile features, for instance, points to a time where the community was well past the particularist-universalist controversy, with the particularist elements now a product of Matthew's conscious historicizing.¹⁷⁷

In contradiction to Brown's and Kasemann's approaches, the so-called *heilsgeschichtlich* approach¹⁷⁸ takes a different tack. It attempts to reconcile the contrary injunctions by appealing to salvation-history. It argues that the particularist directives applied only to the time of Jesus' earthly ministry. The situation changed when the people of Israel, by giving Jesus over to be crucified (27:25), relinquished their status as the chosen people of God. Jesus' death and resurrection then ushered in a new period of salvation history where the mission was extended to πάντα τὰ

¹⁷⁵ Verse 11:1 also suggests a non-Jewish mission on the part of Matthew's Community. Jesus is described as going to "their" cities (ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν). If the mission envisaged was solely one to Israel, the αὐτῶν would be completely unnecessary.

¹⁷⁶ Eugene Boring for instance, offers an analysis of the Great Commission that has several affinities with Brown's discussion of that pericope. See his *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* SNTSMS 46, (Cambridge: University Press, 1982) 204-206. For a different analysis of the above pericope cf. Stanton, "Creative", 287 #37.

¹⁷⁷ Strecker, ("Concept" 72 cf. 73) puts this succinctly, if he overstates his case: "the exclusiveness of the mission to Israel ... finds no explanation in the situation of the redactor, but rather corresponds to his historical reflection: only for Jesus, and thus for the disciples in the lifetime of Jesus, is this restriction valid". See too Stanton, "Creative", 276.

¹⁷⁸ The phrase is used by Kenzo Tagawa, "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew", *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 149-162, 156. The *heilsgeschichtlich* approach is adopted by, among others, J. Meier, *Law*, 27-30, Strecker, "Concept", 72-73, Kasting, *Mission*, 162, Trilling, *Wahre*, 101-105, Bornkamm, "The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus" in *TIM*, (2nd ed., 1982 this article tr. C. E. Carlston and R.P. Scharlemann) 301-327, 315. Barth's ("Law" 100 #4) attempt to posit a "material" instead of a "temporal" distinction fails to recognize the significance of the disciples' teaching. As will become evident, the *heilsgeschichtlich* view corresponds in essentials with the "narrative" approach outlined earlier.

ἔθνη.¹⁷⁹

This position offers a more adequate account of the gentile and Jewish components of the gospel. It is not without significance, for instance, that this view is held by those who still regard Matthew's community as being *intra muros* with the Jewish community,¹⁸⁰ by those who situate it in a gentile Christian milieu,¹⁸¹ and by those who place it somewhere between these positions.¹⁸² In addition, it has the advantage of reconciling more than merely the mission directives. Meier, for one, argues that the restrictions of the law also fall away with the advent of the new age.¹⁸³ If this is the case, some of the other inherent contradictions in the gospel are eased considerably.

It remains to be asked why Matthew would have adopted such an approach. The most satisfactory response is that Matthew's intention is largely apologetic.¹⁸⁴ As Moule has suggested, it furnishes a response to the Jewish question "What business have you going out to the Gentiles?" (answer—the Lord, it is true, kept carefully within

¹⁷⁹ The word "extended" is used deliberately. Some, (such as Hare and Harrington, "Make Disciples of All the Gentiles (Mt 28:19)" *CBQ* 37 (1975) 359-369) have argued that the Jews are no longer included in the missionary efforts of Matthew's community. It is preferable however to include the Jews among the ἔθνη of 28:19. In this respect see John Meier, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102, and Johannes Friedrich, *Gott im Bruder? Eine methodenkritische Untersuchung von Redaktion, Überlieferung und Traditionen in Mt 25, 31-46*, CTM 7 (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1977) 254 and Teil II 115. For an extensive listing of those who support this view see Teil II 115, #43.

¹⁸⁰ See Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 32-33.

¹⁸¹ Strecker, *Weg*, 34-35, Trilling, *Wahre*, 215.

¹⁸² G. Bornkamm, "The Risen Lord" 313, 315. For a thorough overview of the possible relationships between Matthew's church and Judaism see Stanton, "Origin", 1910-1921 and also his "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism" *BJRL* 66 (1984) 264-284. Like Stanton, I consider the "mediating" position ("Matthew's Community is extra-muros yet still defining itself over against Judaism" "Origin" 1921, 1914) as being the most satisfactory reconciliation of the Jewish and gentile components of the gospel. It meshes particularly well with the salvation-historical viewpoint because both are, in essence, mediating positions.

Tagawa, "People" has faulted the *heilsgeschichtlich* approach on the ground that it could only be written from "the standpoint of the Gentile church" (156) since he does not see how a person from a Jewish tradition could acknowledge a time of the gentile church (156 #2). Yet the fact that this approach is supported virtually across the spectrum of opinion suggests that his position is unfounded. (See, for example, Stendahl's comments in K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. with a new introduction (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, (1954), 1968) xiii.)

¹⁸³ J. Meier, "Salvation", 212-213.

¹⁸⁴ On the place of the apologetic motif in Matthew's gospel see Stanton, "Origin" 1921: "... his gospel can be seen in a very broad sense as an apology. It is not *tout court* the Christian answer to Judaism, but in many passages the evangelist writes with more than half an eye on known Jewish objections to Christian teaching." See as well C.F.D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd ed., BNTC (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1966, 1981) 93, Kümmel, *Introduction*, 118.

Israel during his own ministry, and directed his disciples accordingly; but his long-term sayings and his commission were universalist ...)"¹⁸⁵ Functionally, therefore, it not only helps to define the stance of the community *vis-à-vis* the Jews, but situates them in relation to each other.¹⁸⁶

When the above features are taken together, the *heilsgeschichtlich* explanation is ultimately more adequate. For one, unlike Brown's and Käsemann's views it actually reconciles the contradiction in the gospel. Käsemann, and Brown to a lesser degree, both emerge with a contradiction in one form or another. This holds too for the whole question of the Jewish/gentile features. While Brown is forced to skirt about the issue, the salvation-historical approach allows considerable scope for resolving the whole problem—all the more if the "mediating" position is assumed. And finally, the interrelation between this approach and Matthew's historicizing and apologetic results in a consistent and coherent account of some of the leading features in the gospel. For these reasons it is to be preferred.

Conclusion

If the *heilsgeschichtlich* approach is considered most satisfactory, it offers an appropriate rationale for pronouncing on the ethnic identity of the crowds. Matthew has deliberately restricted the mission of Jesus and his disciples to the Jews. It can therefore be assumed that the make up of the crowds is presumed—with the odd exception—to be Jews. The gentile features that figure in, or underlie, Matthew's historical account can best be described as an adumbration of the gentiles' coming

¹⁸⁵ Moule, *Birth*, 125. On the apologetic aspect of the particularist mission cf. Goppelt, *Judentum*, 1818; Trilling, *Wahre*, 102; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 138; Kasting, *Mission*, 113.

¹⁸⁶ For dissenting views cf. Gaston, "Messiah" 34f. and Brown ("Two-fold", 29). The latter maintains that "an apologetic motivation would be possible only if the restriction of the mission to Israel in the Central Section were temporally limited." Since the mission is limited by the Great Commission—a new mandate—the real point of Brown's question seems to be whether there is sufficient justification for regarding the Commission as part of a new age of salvation history. The answer would have to be yes. In an examination of the death and resurrection in Matthew, Meier (*Law*, 30-35) adduces three key elements in the accounts 1) the rending of the temple veil, 2) the earthquake and raising of the saints, 3) the confession of the centurion and those gentiles with him. The last of these clearly anticipates the Great Commission, and suggests that Matthew has carefully worked out his entire salvation—historical schema. If this were not the case, it must then be queried why these features would be present in the gospel.

inclusion in the missionary activity of Matthew's Community, and of course, in the community itself.

This still leaves the question of the inconsistencies mentioned at the beginning of this discussion—Syria and the Decapolis and 15:31. To this, there are several possible explanations. One is that the truth of the gentiles' future mission was so familiar and self-evident to the author that it resulted in a certain lack of clarity or distinctness on his part. This may have some degree of truth, but it is probably better to assume that the author felt that Jesus' position with respect to the gentiles was so clearly stated at 10:5f. and 15:24 that any apparent inconsistencies would naturally be interpreted in a theological light.¹⁸⁷ This, in the long run, is the neatest solution to the whole problem, and does the least violence to the gospel as a whole.

¹⁸⁷ This is the position taken by Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium*, *ad loc* with respect to the Decapolis. If, however, Syria is regarded as the place where the gospel was written, its inclusion at 4:24 would naturally pose no difficulties for members of Matthew's community.

3. ἈΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΩ

Matthew's increased emphasis on "following", particularly in relation to the crowds,¹⁸⁸ has led certain scholars to conclude that this has more than a purely literal signification. Russell for instance observes that the crowds "appear on the fringe of discipleship" and "can be said to follow him",¹⁸⁹ presumably in a metaphorical sense. Minear takes this line a bit further. While acknowledging that ἀκολουθέω can be taken literally, he suggests that in Matthew it "normally signifies qualitative allegiance".¹⁹⁰ This would be the sense in which it relates to the crowds since "in most cases the *ochloi* who follow Jesus have responded to his call and accepted his message."¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸On ἀκολουθέω see: C. Blendinger, "ἀκολουθέω" s.v. "Disciple" *NIDNTT* I 480-483; G. Kittel, "ἀκολουθέω" *TDNT* I, 210-216; G. Schneider, "ἀκολουθέω", *EWNT* I; T. Aerts, "Suivre Jésus: Évolution d'un Thème biblique dans les Évangiles Synoptiques" *ETL* 42 (1966) 476-512; H. D. Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament* BHT 37 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1967) 33-36; G. Bornkamm, *Jesus of Nazareth*, tr. I and F. McLuskey with J. M. Robinson (London: Hodder and Stoughton [1960] 1963) 145-146; W. D. Davies, *SSM*, 95-96; G. Eichholz, *Bergpredigt*, 23; Albert Fuchs, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas: Ein Beiträge zur Quellenkritik*, AB 49 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971) 63-83; M. Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*, Tr. G. Grieg (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981) 40 #9, 59 #84, 85; J. D. Kingsbury, "The Verb AKOLOURTHEIN ("To Follow") As An Index of Matthew's View of His Community" *JBL* 97 (1978) 56-73; P. Minear, "Crowds" 30; Murphy O'Connor, "Structure", 376 #44 (to page 377); Ernst Percy, *Die Botschaft Jesu* (Lund: Gleerup, 1953) 168-174; Russell, "Image", 429; Eduard Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship*, SBT 28 (London: SCM, 1960) Anton Schulz, *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen: Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentliche Jüngerschaft zur christlichen Vorbildethik*, StANT 6 (München: Kösel Verlag, 1962) 63ff.; Strecker, *Weg*, 230-232; Thysman, *Communauté*, 20 and #5 (to page 21); C. H. Turner, "Movements", 238-240; Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164.

According to K. Aland, *Spezialübersichten* 12, ἀκολουθέω is found in Matthew 25 times, Mark 18 and Luke 17 times. Of these twenty-five occurrences, nine are inserted by Matthew 4:22 (cf. Lk 5:11); 8:1; 8:23; 9:27; 10:38; 14:13 (cf. Lk 9:11); 19:2; 19:28 and 20:29. Kingsbury, "Verb" 56 #3 emerges with a similar list, while Gundry, (*Matthew*, 641) finds only eight. This is doubtless because he sees 14:13 as "shared" with Lk 9:11 (cf. p. 5) and not a minor agreement of Matthew and Luke. This latter view however, is to be preferred—cf. Neirynck, *Agreements* 112. Four of the insertions are connected with the crowd(s): 8:1 ὄχλος πολλοί; 14:13 οἱ ὄχλοι; 19:2 ὄχλος πολλοί and 20:29 ὄχλος πολὺς. In addition to these, Matthew has retained three "traditional" references: 4:25 (cf. Mk 3:7 v.l.); 12:15 (cf. Mk 3:7 v.l.) and 21:9 (cf. Mk 11:9). The last of these does not strictly refer to following—οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες κτλ. To these one might also add the τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν of 8:10 (Q cf. Lk 7:9. See Athanasius Polag, *Fragmenta Q. Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1979) 38 in view of its proximity to 8:1 (so Grundmann, *Evangelium* 252; Gundry, *Matthew*, 144).

Needless to say, these nine *Stellen* represent something of an advance on the Marcan account. Mark does associate following (ἀκολουθέω) with the crowds but only once expressly with ὄχλος (5:24). It is possible that 2:15b refers to the crowds, (though it probably refers to the disciples); 3:7 mentions the πλῆθος, while 10:32 is unclear (Malbon asks "are these additional followers drawn from the crowd?" "Disciples" 108). Finally 11:9 just mentions οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες. As for Luke, he only associates the ὄχλος with following at 7:9 and 9:11. From this brief overview it is clear just how much Matthew has developed the idea.

¹⁸⁹ Russell, "Image", 430.

¹⁹⁰ Minear, "Crowds", 30.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 30.

The analysis by Sjef Van Tilborg is similar except that he maintains that the following undertaken by the crowds is no different than that of the disciples: "The crowds do the same as the disciples have done: they follow Jesus: ... the following of Jesus is the definition of the essence of being Christian ... the ὄχλοι do what they have been asked to do by Jesus.¹⁹² These remarks, if correct, would certainly enhance the status of the crowds, and thus align them very closely indeed with the disciples in the first gospel. It remains however to test these contentions.

To do this, the following examination will ask whether the crowds do in fact perform what Jesus has asked them to, whether they are called by Jesus, and finally, whether this "following" is of the same order as that of the disciples.

3a. *The Crowds and the Demands of Jesus*

Can it be said that the crowds do what Jesus has asked them to do? A preliminary examination of the gospel reveals that, in some respects, they appear to. They (apparently) come when he summons them (15:10), leave when he dismisses them (14:22, 23; 15:39), sit on the ground when he bids them to (14:19; 15:35) and listen when he addresses them (11:7; 14, 15; 13:9; cf. 11:7-12:50; 13:3-34; 23:1-39). Yet in Matthew's gospel this is all that Jesus requires of them. They are not, expressly at least, asked to do more.

On the other hand, Matthew gives several weighty indications which suggest a deficiency or inadequacy in the actions of the crowds. The first of these is the pericope of the mothers and brothers of Jesus (12:46-50). In Mark, Jesus suggests that it is the crowds who do the will of God.¹⁹³ In Matthew it is no longer the crowds, but the disciples—καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ κτλ.¹⁹⁴ The

¹⁹² Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 164.

¹⁹³ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος (Mk 3:32) ... καὶ περιβλεψάμενος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν κύκλῳ καθημένους (34). Meze's attempt (in *Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 148-152 to make 34 refer to the Twelve is special pleading and ignores the περὶ αὐτὸν of 32. See, instead, Seán Freyne, *The Twelve: Disciples and Apostles: A Study in the Theology of the First Three Gospels* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1968) 158-159 and Trilling, *Wahre*, 29f..

¹⁹⁴ There is doubtless a measure of transparency in this utterance, but only a measure. The historical element cannot be disregarded either, so that the most adequate analysis of the pericope falls somewhere between the views expressed by Trilling, *Wahre* 29f. and Strecker, *Weg* 193-194. On the

implication with respect to the crowds is undeniable—they do not do the will of God, nor, one might infer, the will of Jesus. Jesus' statement, of course, can and ought to be taken as an adjuration to do the will of God, but at the same time it indicates that up till this point they have not done it. Nor can it be said that Matthew ever offers any indication of a change in this respect.

A similar impression emerges from 11:14-15. Both verses are Matthean.¹⁹⁵ Verse 14 consists of an exceptionally clear identification of John the Baptist with Elijah (αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι)¹⁹⁶ while 15 is an exhortation for the crowds to hear (ὁ ἔχων ὅτα ἀκουέτω). Yet it is more than an exhortation; because of the significance of the identification in v. 14, it is tantamount to a warning.¹⁹⁷ It soon becomes apparent, however, that this warning goes unheeded. At 17:12 in a significant amplification of Mark (cf. 9:13), Matthew has Jesus say of John that Elijah had already come, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν. The plural here is best taken as a reference to the people of Israel—the leaders and the crowds.¹⁹⁸ This deficient understanding can also be seen elsewhere. Where Jesus has described John to them as περισσότερον προφήτου (11:9) the crowds continue to regard him simply as a "prophet" (ὡς προφήτην 14:5, 21:26). They have clearly failed to hear as Jesus had exhorted them to.

Both of the above examples suggest, therefore, that except in simple matters the

question of discipleship in Matthew see, Barth, "Law", *TIM* 105-125; Freyne, *Twelve*, 151-206; Gerhard W. Ittel, *Jesus und die Jünger* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970); Mark Sheridan, "Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke" *BTB* 3 (1973) 235-255; W. G. Thompson, "Matthew's Portrait of Jesus' Disciples" *BT* 19 (1981) 16-24 as well as Edwards, "Uncertain Faith" and Luz, "Disciples".

¹⁹⁵ Manson, *Sayings*, 185, Gundry, *Matthew*, 211.

¹⁹⁶ See J. Meier, "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel" *JBL* 99 (1980) 383-405, 397; Wolfgang Trilling, "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus", *BZ* 3 (1959) 271-289, 279-280 and Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in Gospel Tradition* SNTSMS #7, (Cambridge: University Press, 1968) 80.

¹⁹⁷ Trilling calls it an "Appell mit einen drohenden Unterton" "Täufertradition", 281. See also Wink, *John*, 32; J. Schönle, *Jesus und die Juden. Die Theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt 11*, BBET 17 (Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1982) 129-159.

¹⁹⁸ Schweizer, *Matthew*, 351; Hill, *Matthew*, 269; McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 253 who also includes the possibility of the scribes; Sheridan, "Disciples", 245 "people"; Armin Kretzer, *Die Herrschaft der Himmel und die Söhne des Reiches: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Basileabegriff und Basileaverständnis im Matthäusevangelium*, SBM 10 (Stuttgart: Echter KBW, 1971) 73f.; Siegfried Pedersen, "Die Proklamation Jesu als des Eschatologischer Offenbarungsträgers (Mt 17:1-13)" *NT* 17 (1975) 241-264, 263. Against this view see Gaechter, *Evangelium*, 574; Fenton, *St. Matthew*, 280.

crowds do not do what Jesus has asked them to. They, like the Pharisees, have left the "weightier" matters undone.

3b. *The Call of Jesus*

The next question is whether the crowds are ever called by Jesus. Does he ever bid them, literally or metaphorically, to follow after him? It is certainly the case with Mark's gospel—as Malbon observes, in Mark "the disciples, crowds whoever—everyone is a potential follower".¹⁹⁹ The same can be said for Luke, where Jesus directs a summons to follow him, *πρὸς πάντας* (9:23). Strikingly, this does not hold for Matthew. In the first gospel Jesus never "calls" the crowd nor summons them to follow him.²⁰⁰

This can be seen from a consideration of Jesus' general exhortations to follow him (or discussions of the consequences of following him). There are three in Matthew—10:38; 16:24; 19:28. The first of these is situated in the Mission discourse (and is therefore aimed at the disciples) while its parallel in Luke is spoken to the "great multitudes" (14:25 *ὄχλοι πολλοί*).

A similar situation emerges with the second passage. In Mark this adjuration ("if any man would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me" 8:34) is addressed to the crowds after Jesus has specifically summoned them (34 *καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*). In Luke, as noted above, it is spoken to all (9:23). Matthew, however, has omitted the reference to the crowd. Jesus continues to speak solely to the disciples—*τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ* (16:24).²⁰¹

Finally, at 19:28 and parallels, Matthew has expanded on Jesus' rejoinder to

¹⁹⁹ Malbon, "Disciples", 110.

²⁰⁰ Aerts ("Suivre Jésus", 491) argues differently. He claims that Matthew "conçoit ce groupe [sc. those asked to follow] plus large que les seuls Douze". This is highly questionable. In two of the three calling pericopae (10:38; 19:27-28) Matthew expressly mentions the Twelve (as at 10:1) or implies them (19:28 *ὁμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*). The third, 16:24 ff. nowhere suggests a larger group. Aerts seems to have interpreted this findings in light of the other two synoptic gospels.

²⁰¹ Fenton, (*St. Matthew*, 273), remarks "... Mt has omitted the reference to the *multitude* (or crowds) ... probably because Matthew considers them incapable of receiving this teaching".

Peter, who has just stated "we have left everything and followed you" (19:27//Mk 10:28// Lk 18:28). Matthew's expansion²⁰² immediately takes up the ἀκολουθέω of 19:27 and applies it explicitly to the Twelve²⁰³ ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι, giving them the privilege to judge the twelve tribes. The phrase, in other words, is used as a *terminus technicus* for the twelve. Having made this pronouncement he goes on to speak of a broader sphere of adherents (19:29 πᾶς ὅστις) for whom the reference to following does not apply. In Mark and Luke, however, the disciples and the broader sphere of adherents are lumped together—Peter's question is immediately followed by οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν κτλ (Mk 10:29, Lk 18:29). Once again, Matthew has Jesus confine his call to follow (or his comments about the nature of that following) to the disciples.

The above instances make it very evident indeed that Matthew has scrupulously limited Jesus' "call" to follow him to his disciples alone. The crowds are not called by Jesus.

In addition to these "general" exhortations to follow, Matthew's gospel demonstrates a related pattern with the commands for individuals to follow Jesus. With virtually no exceptions,²⁰⁴ the disciples do not follow Jesus unless he first commands them. The importance of this distinction for Matthew can be seen from the episode where Peter walks on the water (14:22-23). Peter says "Lord, if it is you, bid me come to you on the water." He said "Come" (28-29). Barth perceptively remarks that it is "deutlich gemacht, daß Petrus nicht eigenmächtiges, sondern auf den Befehl Jesu hin geht",²⁰⁵ and this same concern appears to apply to the disciples and ἀκολουθέω. The initiative is always seen to rest with Jesus.

This is the case with Peter and Andrew (4:18ff.), James and John (4:21f.) and the disciple (ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν 8:21) who wishes to bury his father first.²⁰⁶

²⁰² Luke situates a related passage at 22:28-30 without any reference to ἀκολουθέω.

²⁰³ See above, n. 200.

²⁰⁴ The one possible exception will be treated below.

²⁰⁵ Barth, "Glaube", 287. It "presents a disciple on the way of discipleship .. set in motion by a command of Jesus", Held *TIM* 206.

²⁰⁶ The scribe at 8:19 is not to be taken as a disciple (though this is grammatically possible from the careless ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν in 8:21), as can be surmised from the different manner in

This also holds for the calling of Matthew (9:9). There is an apparent exception at 8:23 where it states that when Jesus "got into the boat, his disciples followed him" (8:23). Here though, the command to cross over has already taken place at v.18. This is made emphatic by Matthew's change of Mark's διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν (Mk 4:35) to ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν.²⁰⁷ Held remarks that "In connexion with Matthew 8:23 this command must be understood as a command to discipleship,"²⁰⁸ and indeed this could be said of each of Jesus' calls.

The same pattern extends to the omission(s) Matthew makes to Mark. Matthew has eliminated at least one incident in Mark where the disciples are described as following Jesus without first having been commanded by Jesus. The description of the disciples following Jesus to Nazareth (Mk 6:1 καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ) is excised. Mk 2:15 or 10:32 might refer to disciples in Mark,²⁰⁹ but both references are omitted by Matthew.

This leaves only one possible exception in the first gospel. This is when Peter follows Jesus after the arrest (ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν 26:58) without Jesus' bidding. There are several possible explanations. It could be taken literally instead of metaphorically and so be the only instance of a disciple following Jesus without there being a metaphorical underpinning.²¹⁰ This does not fit very well with the omission of Mark 6:1 however, and in addition, the context suggests something more. What it suggests is that Peter's behaviour is being represented as an antitype of discipleship—of following that has not been initiated by Jesus. He is

which the two address Jesus—the disciple as κύριε, the scribe as διδάσκαλε. The other disciples address Jesus as κύριε (8:25; 14:28; 14:30; 16:22; 17:4; 18:21; 26:22) except for Judas who calls him ῥαββί (26:25; 26:49). See Thompson, "Reflections" 372 #33, Christoph Burger, "Jesus Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9" *ZThK* 70 (1973) 272-287, 276; Kingsbury, "Verb" 60 and note 31. Heinz Joachim Held, "Matthew as Interpreter of the Miracle Stories", *TIM* 165-299, 202-203 leaves the question open. Against the view, see among others, Gundry, *Matthew*, 151-152.

²⁰⁷ On the place of κελεύω in Matthew see Zumstein, *Condition*, 221.

²⁰⁸ Held, *TIM*, 202. See also Bornkamm's perceptive remarks, *TIM* 55. John Paul Heil, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21*, AB 87 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981) 95ff., misses the importance of ἀκολουθεῖν here, and for this reason his criticisms of Held and Bornkamm are too precipitate.

²⁰⁹ See notes 98 and 188 above.

²¹⁰ So Aerts, "Suivre", 507. At 9:19 both Jesus and the disciples follow the ruler, while at 8:10 τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν are the crowds.

clearly not taking up his cross and following Jesus as he has been told to do—he comes "to see how the matter would end".²¹¹ Nor does he live up to his promise at 26:35 "Even if I must die with you I will not deny you"—he denies Jesus, not once, but three times.²¹² This is not discipleship, but the obverse.²¹³ The point seems to be clear—at Jesus' instigation Peter can even walk on water; left to his own initiative he can do nothing but deny his master.

If this argument holds, all of the above elements produce a consistent picture—all of the following done by the disciples is initiated by Jesus. When this is joined with the findings above, a singular picture emerges. It is the disciples who do the will of God and the disciples who are called to follow. The crowds, on the other hand, appear not to do what Jesus asks, are certainly not called by him and therefore cannot be said to follow in the same sense that the disciples do. It is very clear then, that the following of the crowds is of a different order.

3c. *The Following of the Crowds*

If the following of the crowds is of a different order, what does it mean? Why has he taken so much care to emphasize their following of Jesus? Surely it has more than a purely scenic significance. The location of these verses offers a solution. Ulrich Luz and several others have noted that these verses are closely linked to miracle or healing stories.²¹⁴ Luz remarks *à propos* of ἀκολουθέω that it "is striking ... that frequently it is the crowds who follow Jesus, and secondly in the redactional passages without exception the experience of the miracle follows only after the mention of

²¹¹ McNeile observes that "only Matthew suggests Peter's motive; it was not to die with his Master as he had boasted, but 'to see how the matter would end', *St. Matthew*, 398. See too Trilling's remarks in *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*, tr. K. Smyth (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969) II, 239-240.

²¹² Cf. Lagrange, *Saint Matthieu*, 505.

²¹³ Malbon sees irony in the Markan account of Peter's following: "There is a profound irony in Peter's following [14:54 ἀκολουθέω] Jesus at a distance into the courtyard of the high priest, for while the house of the high priest is the scene of Jesus' trial, the courtyard is the scene of Peter's denial", "Disciples", 110. The same holds true for Matthew's account where the contrast between Jesus before the chief priests and Peter before his accusers further stresses the antitypical character of Peter's discipleship.

²¹⁴ U. Luz, "Disciples", 124 #64 as well as G. Schneider, "ἀκολουθέω", col. 122; A. Sand, *Matthäus*, 88 and Kingsbury, "Verb", 61.

discipleship (i.e. ἀκολουθέω)²¹⁵ In this context he cites 4:25 (trad.), 8:1, 8:10 (trad.); 8:23; 9:27; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29; 20:34 (trad.).²¹⁶ On the basis of Luz's remarks Schneider goes on to conclude "Daraus kann die Auffassung erschlossen werden, daß erst die Nachfolge Jesu zur Erfahrung seiner Wundermacht gelangen läßt."²¹⁷

In light of our results above, perhaps these observations can be slightly redirected. In the first place, none of the verses Luz cites, with the exception of 8:23, actually refers to the disciples, so it is not appropriate to talk about discipleship in this context. Second, Luz speaks of "miracles", but again, every one of the verses cited, excepting 8:23, deals expressly with healing. This offers a significant correlation—in the above passages every account of the crowds or supplicants following Jesus is itself followed by a reference to healing. This can be seen very vividly in some of the crowd passages where the ὄχλοι are healed:

- 12:15b καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ [ὄχλοι] πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας
- 14:13b,14 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων¹⁴ καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν
- 19:2 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ

The same sort of pattern is evident in the remaining "crowd" passages, if not so immediately striking. At 4:24-5 the order is reversed; the healing (v.24) precedes the following. A variety of factors can account for the change,²¹⁸ but it is not of fundamental significance since 4:24 helps account for the following mentioned in 25.²¹⁹

²¹⁵ Luz, "Disciples", 124 #64.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*

²¹⁷ G. Schneider, "ἀκολουθέω", col. 122.

²¹⁸ Matthew is preparing for the Sermon on the Mount and Jesus' seeing the crowd (5:1 Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους) would follow rather awkwardly on ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. On the other hand, the summary in 25 (cf. Mk 3:7) serves as an admirable *introitus* to the Sermon on the Mount since it emphasizes the magnitude of the crowd Jesus will address.

²¹⁹ An instructive parallel to the above four passages can be seen at 15:29-30 where προσέρχομαι is used instead of ἀκολουθέω because Jesus is sitting in a position of authority: καὶ

What is striking about the first three of the passages above is the correlation of ἀκολουθέω with θεραπεύω—the healing is immediately consequent upon the following. It is as though the healing were the natural consequence of the following. This is brought out even further by the πάντας in 12:15b and the αὐτούς of 19:2. Both are intended to show the absolute efficacy of Jesus' healing authority, but have, in addition, the related effect of displaying the absolute need of the crowds. This is so, even if the πάντας and αὐτούς are meant to apply only to the sick of the crowd—the impression is still extended to the crowd as a whole.

The other three references to the crowds' following (8:1; 8:10; 20:29) all occur in the context of the healing of individuals. These individual suppliants are not members of the crowds,²²⁰ and the healing accounts themselves differ in some respects from those noted above.²²¹ In spite of this, they still suggest a desire on Matthew's part to associate the following of the crowds with healing. This is not all that surprising—the majority of the healings in Matthew's sources are of individuals, not of the crowds *per se*. Since he has added several references to the healing of the crowd in general (4:24; 19:2; cf. 15:30, all without parallels), this would be the most natural way of further relating the two ideas.²²²

ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ καὶ προσήλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν χολούς, τυφλοὺς ... καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς.

Of the four passages cited, 4:24-5 and 19:2 are both without parallel in their conjunction of ἀκολουθέω with θεραπεύω. Mark's gospel has a parallel to 12:15b, but the two words are much more widely separated—ἠκολούθησεν is at 3:7, ἐθεράπευσεν at 3:10. Matthew has not only tied the two together, he has changed Mk's πολλοὺς (γὰρ ἐθεράπευσαν) to πάντας; all of the crowds are healed. Verses 14:13b, 14 have a parallel in Luke 9:11. In this context however Matthew, unlike Luke, has taken over Mark's phrase about the compassion of Jesus (καὶ ἐσπλαγγνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς). In Matthew, however, it takes form not in teaching as in Mark, but in healing. All these features therefore suggest that Matthew has undertaken to correlate the two actions in a very deliberate fashion.

²²⁰ In the healing of the centurion's servant (8:5-13) the centurion appears to approach Jesus when Jesus and the crowds enter Capernaum (8:5). At 20:29f. the two blind men are seated at the side of the road as Jesus passes (20:30), while the leper appears to approach Jesus and the crowds as they descend from the mountain (8:1).

²²¹ In the healing account at 20:29ff. the two blind men follow Jesus *after* they have been healed (20:34). This might however be explained by Matthew's direct dependence on Mark's Bartimaeus narrative which likewise has Bartimaeus follow Jesus after being healed (10:52). What is interesting is that Matthew has not extended this to the other narrative modelled on the Bartimaeus account (9:27-31). This is a much freer rendering, and here they follow Jesus prior to being healed (ἠκολούθησαν [αὐτῷ] δύο τυφλοὶ 9:27) but do not follow him afterward. The above anomaly might then be explained as Matthew's desire to keep the Markan framework at 20:29-34 even if it runs counter to his usual method of expression.

²²² It might justly be asked, why, if Matthew was so intent on relating healing and following with the crowds, did he not have the supplicants come from the crowds. Although this can't really be answered in general, the answer is quite clear with respect to the above three healings. In the case of

Taken as a whole, these factors are highly suggestive. In a few instances he has simply associated healing and following, but in the remaining passages, the healing of the crowds is related to their following of Jesus. The implication would seem to be clear—healing is one of the dominant motifs in the crowds' following of Jesus.²²³ And one would not be remiss in turning the phrase around and saying it is one of their dominant motives for following Jesus.²²⁴ If this is the case, Luz's analysis does not hold at all. They are not healed because of their implied discipleship, but because they are needy. The crowds follow Jesus, at least in part, in order to be healed.

Why then does the healing come after the following? The reason is not ecclesiological as Luz supposes,²²⁵ but christological. Matthew is not at all concerned with discipleship in these instances but with the portrait of Jesus. Matthew has placed a great deal of emphasis in his gospel on Jesus as servant,²²⁶ and the healing accounts give content to this portrait.²²⁷ Held well observes that the healing stories in Matthew "do not show the thaumaturge who seeks to gain recognition and admiration through his deeds, but the servant of God as he works on behalf of the helpless."²²⁸

The ἀκολουθεῖν plays a vital part in this because it is there to focus attention upon Jesus. The action of the crowds is directed solely toward Jesus, and by virtue of

8:1 a leper is hardly likely to be mingling with the crowds (contra Minear, "Crowd", 30). As to the centurion, apart from being a gentile, the house in Capernaum is an integral part of the story (8:8) and requires that he be situated in Capernaum. The same holds true of the two blind men—it is necessary that they be dissociated from Jesus and the crowds so as to bring out the two very different responses they elicit from the crowds and Jesus.

²²³ Lohmeyer has also recognized the need of Matthew's crowds though perhaps he gives it slightly too much emphasis. "Ein Besonderheit hat Matthäus vor allem betont: ὄχλοι sind die Menge der Kranken und Leidenden, der 'Geplagten und hingefunkenen' (9:36), der Schafe, die keinen Hirten haben, 'und er heilt sie alle' so daß ὄχλος fast zu einem Wechselwort für die mit aller Not belasteten wird, aus denen er darum durch Wunder und Lehre die Gemeinde der 'Nachfolgenden' schafft", *Matthäus*, 78.

²²⁴ This is not to say that the crowds' illnesses are their only reason for following Jesus. Clearly there are others such as Jesus' teaching (and manner of teaching 7:28), his proclamation of the gospel, and perhaps even his feeding of the crowds (14:13-21; 15:32-39 cf. John 6:26). Nevertheless, just as healing predominates in the list of signs Jesus gives John the Baptist (11:5), one could say that a desire to be healed is the predominant motive for the crowds' following of Jesus.

²²⁵ Luz, "Disciples", 124 #64. The same holds true for the last clause of Lohmeyer's remarks *Matthäus*, 78.

²²⁶ For a careful discussion of the place of the servant in Matthew's christology see David Hill, "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology" *JSNT* 6 (1980) 2-16.

²²⁷ On the place of healing in the first gospel cf. Comber, "Verb", 431-434 and J. P. Heil, "Significant Aspects of the Healing Miracles in Matthew" *CBQ* 41 (1979) 274-287, as well as the extensive discussion in Held, *TIM* esp. 259-264.

²²⁸ Held, *TIM*, 264.

this, illumines his compassion and yet, at the same time, his majesty and authority. They follow him not merely because he is well-disposed towards them, but because of his power to act out of this disposition. Thus Matthew is able, through his conjunction of healing with following, to develop several facets of his understanding of Jesus as servant.²²⁹

What all this means therefore, is that the "following" of the crowds, is supplicatory. They follow Jesus in order to be ministered to—they are the sheep without a shepherd and they follow out of their need.²³⁰ It goes without saying that the following of the disciples is of an entirely different order. The disciples follow to minister and to perform what Jesus has required of them.²³¹ So while the following of the disciples and the crowds appear similar, they are fundamentally different.

Conclusion

Although there is a superficial resemblance between the following of the crowds and that of the disciples, the two prove, upon closer inspection, to be vastly different. In marked distinction to the disciples, the crowds do not heed Jesus, and are never enjoined by Jesus to follow him. Their following does not indicate a "qualitative allegiance" to Jesus, but a fundamental need. The occurrence of ἀκολουθέω with

²²⁹ Held likewise juxtaposes the "triumphant" with the lowly character of the servant, *TIM*, 263-264. It is worth noting that the following of the crowds also serves another function in the gospel which is tangential to our discussion. It should also be regarded as apologetic, and calculated to suggest that during his ministry Jesus was followed by great numbers of his own people, people to whom he ministered unstintingly, though he was later rejected by them.

²³⁰ Even at the triumphal entry there is an indirect indication of their status as supplicants rather than a group with possible political aspirations. Their mention of the Son of David immediately brings to mind their use of the expression of Jesus in a healing capacity at 12:23.

²³¹ The truth of this observation can be seen in other parts of the gospel. In Matthew's account of the miraculous feedings for instance, the difference in roles is patent. The formula ἔδωκεν (ἐδίδου 15:36) τοῖς μαθηταῖς (τοὺς ἄρτους 14:19) οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις is found in both accounts. Here, as Held emphasizes, the disciples do not merely distribute, they give as well: "whereas the other two evangelists speak only of a giving by Jesus ... in Matthew the giving, from ἔδωκεν on, applies to the activity of the disciples" (cf. 14:15-21, *TIM* 185, cf. Van Tilborg, *Leaders* 162-163). Here the crowds figure as supplicants.

The same rationale holds for 9:36, the passage about the greatness of the harvest. Here, in contradistinction to Luke, it is addressed to the disciples (versus the Seventy-two in Luke 10:2) and made to apply explicitly to the crowds. (On the Matthean construction of this passage, see P. Hoffman, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* NTabh (Münster: Aschendorff, 1972), 256.; S. Schulz, *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972) 404-405). This makes the distinction between ministers and those to whom they minister very clear. As Freyne remarks (*Twelve*, 76) "after seeing the crowd and wishing to help them Jesus turns towards the disciples almost instinctively to remedy the situation".

θεραπεύω suggests that Matthew's intention is to bring this need to the fore so that he can, at the same time stress Jesus' (and the disciples') compassion in requiting that need.

4. THE RESPONSE OF THE CROWDS TO JESUS

The next section will focus on the crowds' reaction to Jesus. This will include a consideration of individual reactions attributed to them (ἐκπλήσσομαι; θαυμάζω, ἐξίστημι, φοβέομαι, δοξάζω) as well as the statements they make regarding Jesus and his activity.²³² As with the analysis of ἀκολουθέω the purpose of the discussion is to consider the crowds' relation to Jesus. Do their reactions suggest a disciple-like faith on their part, or something rather less?²³³ This discussion²³⁴ will begin by examining the individual reactions of the ὄχλοι,²³⁵ with a related discussion of the disciples if the words are used of them.

4a. ἐκπλήσσομαι²³⁶

²³² This will exclude 21:9, 11 and 46 which will be treated separately below.

²³³ Although he provides no references to support his statement, Minear refers to the crowds' "faith" and even to their "worshipping" Jesus. Since there are only a limited number of passages which discuss the crowds in Matthew one would expect that besides 21:9, 11, 46 the passages to which he would refer are those treated below. (See Minear, "Crowds", 30.)

²³⁴ For the purposes of this discussion it is not necessary to consider the background of the following expressions. For a brief examination consult Tagawa, *Miracles*, 99-101, who establishes that "dans la littérature grecque la description de l'étonnement et de la crainte des hommes qui ont reconnu les êtres divins, sert à faire du récit un récit d'épiphanie; par contre dans la littérature juives de l'Ancien Testament aux écrits de Qumrân, le mot merveilleux est en général utilisé pour qualifier objectivement des oeuvres de Dieu et la crainte de Dieu est l'expression de la foi d'un fidèle israélite. Donc, dans la monde de tradition juive l'étonnement et la crainte sont un motif assez général et qui ne relève pas exclusivement de la terminologie particulière de la théophanie," (100). The following treatment will assume the correctness of these observations.

²³⁵ On the following words as typical crowd responses in healing stories Bultmann, *HST*, 225-226. Theissen (*The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*, tr. F. McDonagh, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), notes that "Matthew almost always gives a specific subject" to those who were seized with amazement (69).

²³⁶ There are four occurrences of ἐκπλήσσομαι in Mt. 7:28 // Mk 1:22 (cf. Mk. 11:18); 13:54 // Mk 6:2; 19:25 // Mk 10:26; 22:33 no parallel. Matthew also omits the word in his parallel to Mk 7:37 (Mt 15:31), probably because he wants the word to apply only to Jesus' teaching.

This word is used consistently²³⁷ throughout Matthew to describe reactions of individuals to Jesus' teaching—generally shock or astonishment. It is used thus of the crowds at 7:28 and 22:33. Verse 7:29 explains that this was because of his ἐξουσία; he taught as one having authority, quite unlike the scribes. It is also used of the disciples' reaction to Jesus' pronouncement about rich men (19:25, cf. 23-24).²³⁸

On the other hand, the word also describes the initial reaction of the inhabitants of Nazareth to his teaching; his wisdom and mighty works (13:54). If ἐκπλήσσομαι is held, however, to imply any sort of faith or reverence, this is an awkward passage for such a view since the Nazareans go on to revile Jesus. Grässer has argued that this represents a fundamental inconsistency in the basic account: "Here there remains a crack, which we cannot get rid of either by the psychological explanation of two contrary impressions among the hearers, or by a harmonizing exegesis, by which we are taught to see ἐκπλήσσομαι and ἐσκανδαλίζοντο in the same way ..." ²³⁹ While agreeing with the inadequacy of both proposed solutions it still appears that Matthew, at least, has attempted to pave over this crack. This can be seen from his use of the question πόθεν οὖν τούτω ταῦτα πάντα ([13:56] not found in Mark) which presents the crux of the problem. They recognize the force of ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις, but not the origin. As a result they refuse to have faith in him. Still, they have no doubt about Jesus' attributes, and for this reason their amazement is genuine. What this suggests about ἐκπλήσσομαι therefore, is that it represents an immediate, unconsidered reaction on the part of the hearer.²⁴⁰ It could conceivably result in faith, but it might just as easily, as the above pericope shows, result in a rejection of faith. At best, it is a prelude.

²³⁷ Both Zizemer, (*Verhältnis*, 45), and Van Segbroeck, "Jésus rejeté par sa patrie", *Bib* 49 (1968) 167-198, 180, note the consistency with which Matthew uses the expression. See in addition the discussions of the word by H. Balz, "ἐκπλήσσομαι" *EWNT* I col. 1023; D. H. Field, ἐκπλήσσω, s.v. "Ecstasy" etc. *NIDNTT* I, 529-530; and Richard Karpinski, *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ à la Base de l'Enseignement de Jésus et de la Mission Apostolique selon S. Matthieu* (Rome, Institute des Recherches Ecclésiastiques, 1961) 9.

²³⁸ Neither praise nor blame seem to attend this response through Beare, *Matthew*, *ad loc.*, detects a slight note of reproach in Jesus' reply.

²³⁹ Erich Grässer, "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI, 1-6a) Notes on the Redaction and Theology of St. Mark" *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 1-23, 6-7.

²⁴⁰ See Karpinski, *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ*, 9.

4b. θαυμάζω²⁴¹

This word is used of a variety of groups and in a variety of situations in Matthew. It is twice used of the crowds—at 9:33 and 15:31. In both instances it describes their response to deeds of Jesus—his casting out of a demon (9:33) and his multiple healings (15:31). Intriguingly, it is also used of the Herodians and disciples of the Pharisees (22:22—albeit in dependence on Mark 12:17) marvelling at Jesus' reply to their trick question. Pilate also marvels at Jesus' silence before his accusers (27:14).

The disciples marvel at the withering of the fig tree—something unique to Matthew's account. Matthew has added the word to Mark's version, and, what is more, suggested that it represents an inadequate reaction on the part of the disciples. Jesus' answer (21:21 cf. 21:20) implies a measure of doubt on their part. As Bertram observes, "the reply of Jesus shows that this astonishment contains an element of critical questioning, of enquiry and even of doubt".²⁴²

These findings are highly suggestive. If, on the one hand, the Jewish leaders marvel, and on the other, it is considered a deficient reaction on the part of the disciples, the implication is clear. The reaction as such denotes no commitment or faith on the part of the beholder.²⁴³ As with ἐκπλήσσομαι it is perhaps best regarded as a spontaneous uncritical reaction to something that is awesome or overwhelming.

²⁴¹ Θαυμάζω is found five times in Matthew: 8:10 // Lk 7:9; 8:27 // Lk 8:25 // (Mk 4:41 φοβέομαι); 9:33 // Lk 11:14, 15:31 // (Mk 7:37 ἐκπλήσσομαι); 21:20 no parallels; 22:22 // Lk 20:26 // (Mk 12:17 ἐκθαυμάζω); 27:14 // Mk 15:5. He omits Mk 5:20; 6:6 and 15:4 as well as Lk 11:14 (for which he uses ἐξίστημι instead 12:23). At 15:31 it occurs with δοξάζω which will be treated below.

On the term see F. Annen, "θαυμάζω", *EWNT* II, s.v. col. 332-334; Georg Bertram, "θαῦμα" etc. *TDNT* III esp. 37-40; W. Mundle, "θαῦμα" s.v. "Miracle" etc. *NIDNTT* II, 620-26; Schenk, *Sprache*, 281-82; Zizemer, *Verhältnis*, 127-128.

²⁴² Bertram, "θαῦμα" etc. *TDNT* III, 38. So too Barth, "Law" *TIM* 119 #3 "deficient faith"; and R. A. Edwards, "Uncertain Faith", 58.

²⁴³ This is also the opinion of Mundle, "θαῦμα" 624—"such amazement, of course, in no way presupposes faith, though it may well presuppose an inkling of the presence of divine authority" (he is speaking of the way the word is used in the synoptic gospels' account of the Jewish leaders' amazement).

4c. ἐξίστημι²⁴⁴

This verb occurs only once in Matthew, and its presence can likely be attributed to Mark's use of the word of Jesus at 3:21. Matthew has taken the word over, but made it apply to the crowds instead of Jesus.²⁴⁵ The expression denotes being "beside oneself" through astonishment or fear,²⁴⁶ in this case as a result of being confronted with one of Jesus' mighty acts. In essence though, the reaction is probably very similar to that of θαυμάζω, because this pericope is a doublet of 9:32-34 where θαυμάζω is used of the crowds' reaction.²⁴⁷ That this is, once again, a preliminary reaction is borne out by the fact that Matthew hesitates to use it of the disciples' response to Jesus in the Walking on the Water pericope (Mt 14:22-33; Mk 6:45-52). Where the disciples in Mark ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο (6:51), in Matthew they worship (προσεκύνησαν) him and confess that he is the Son of God (14:33).²⁴⁸

4d. φοβέομαι²⁴⁹

Like ἐξίστημι, φοβέομαι is used only once of the crowds in Matthew—at 9:8 it indicates their response to the healing of a paralytic. Here it probably denotes awe or fear arising from a confrontation with the divine or numinous.²⁵⁰ Yet it might suggest a reaction subsequent to amazement, or one that is more profound (cf. Lk 5:26 ἔλαβεν ... ἐδόξαζον ... καὶ ἐκπλήσθησαν φόβου). In this regard, there is a textual variant

²⁴⁴ The word occurs once in Matthew—12:23 // Mt 9:33 θαυμάζω // Lk 11:14 θαυμάζω. Matthew omits Mk 2:12 in favour of φοβέομαι and similarly excises it at Mk 5:42 and 6:51 (of the disciples).

On the word itself confer: Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.; J. Lambrecht, "ἐξίστημι" *EWNT* II:17-19; W. Mundle, ἔκστασις s.v. "Ecstasy" etc.; *NIDNTT* I 527-528 and A. Oepke, "ἔκστασις κτλ" *TWNT* II esp. 456-457; Schenk, *Sprache*, 282.

²⁴⁵ So Lambrecht, "ἐξίστημι", *EWNT* II 17-19.

²⁴⁶ Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. or in the case of Jesus at Mk 3:21, out of one's senses.

²⁴⁷ See for instance Held, *TIM*, 247 and also E. Schweizer, "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew" *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 213-230 who follows him with approval (213).

²⁴⁸ On προσκυνέω see Heil, *Sea*, 66; W. G. Thompson, *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Matthew 17:22-18:35* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970) 214-215.

²⁴⁹ φοβέομαι is found 18 times in Matthew. Where Matthew uses it of the crowds (with δοξάζω) 9:8, Mark has ἐξίστημι (2:12) and Lk ἔκστασις (5:26). He likewise omits Mk 5:15 // Lk 8:35. Instances of φοβέομαι not expressly related to the crowds' or disciples' fear of God or Jesus are not discussed here.

²⁵⁰ For discussions of φοβέομαι see, H. Balz, "φοβέομαι" *EWNT* III cols. 1026-33; H. Balz, "φοβέω κτλ, *TWNT* IX, esp. 205; W. Mundle, "Fear, Awe" *NIDNTT* I, 621-624; Schenk, *Sprache*, 455-57; Zizemer, *Verhältnis*, 124-125.

on 9:8 with ἐθαύμασαν the variant reading,²⁵¹ à propos of which, Metzger remarks: "Superficial readers and copyists, failing to see the deep meaning of "were afraid" (i.e., people felt a profound sense of awe and alarm in the presence of One who had the right to forgive sins), substituted for ἐφοβήθησαν what seemed to be a more appropriate word, ἐθαύμασαν ("marvelled", or "were astonished")."²⁵² This superficially accords with the incidental use of the word in relation to the disciples (14:27; 17:6,7). In spite of this, it must be noted that Matthew regards it as an inadequate response on at least one occasion.²⁵³ This can be inferred from the Stilling of the Storm pericope, where Matthew has transformed Mark's fearful disciples (ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν Mk 4:41) into wondering men (οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν 8:27) who ask the very same question Mark's disciples did. The reason for this change, according to Gnllka, is "die Jünger in ein besseres Licht zu rücken: die Jünger sind die Verstehenden".²⁵⁴ Matthew's desire to characterize the disciples as "those who understand", is probably also responsible for his omission of Mk 9:32 and 10:32 (if it refers to the disciples).²⁵⁵ When these features are drawn together it seems better to suppose that fear, for the disciples at least, is an inappropriate reaction to Jesus.²⁵⁶ It may well designate a more profound sense of awe, but again it would be an immediate and unconsidered reaction—one that suggests, at times, a deficiency of understanding.

4e. δοξάζω²⁵⁷

²⁵¹ C, K, L, Δ, Θ, Π and a number of miniscules read ἐθαύμασαν.

²⁵² Metzger, *Textual*, 24-25. This argument is, of course, two-edged.

²⁵³ Luz goes considerably further. He maintains that "in Matthew's, redaction fear is consistently understood as the expression of human unbelief and little faith", "Disciples", 121 #30.

²⁵⁴ Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 35. Contrast Gundry, *Matthew*, 157 who tries unconvincingly, to argue that the men are the disciples. In this he is certainly against the broad consensus of opinion, cf. e.g. Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 152. Thompson, ("Reflections", 374 #26 and esp. 315-316 #51), offers a good discussion of the identity of "the men" on the beach.

²⁵⁵ Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 152 makes the general observation that "über Jesu Worte gerät wohl das Volk, aber nicht die Jünger in 'große furcht'". This is because Jesus' disciples "Worte und Werke Jesu 'verstehen'". Both Frankemölle (152f.) and Strecker, *Weg*, 192 see this as part of Matthew's tendency to "idealize" the disciples.

²⁵⁶ Worth noting is the fact that of the three times where the disciples are said to fear in Matthew, two (17:6,7) refer to fear in the presence of God of the transfiguration. This leaves 14:27 (cf. 14:26).

²⁵⁷ δοξάζω occurs 4 times in Matthew. It is twice used of the crowds—9:8 // Mk 2:12 // Lk 5:26 and 15:31- no //, and occurs twice in the Sermon on the Mount (5:16; 6:2).

On the word itself see Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. and Kittel, "δοκέω" κτλ, TDNT II esp. 232-

Matthew twice relates that the crowds glorify God: οἱ ὄχλοι ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις (9:8) and ὥστε τὸν ὄχλον θαυμάσαι ... καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ. The position of δοξάζω in both sentences indicates that it is an action that appears to be consequent upon, and subsequent to, the crowds' reaction of fear or astonishment. If, as suggested above, these latter reactions, are as it were, simply preludes, then δοξάζω may point to a more considered and deliberate action on the part of the crowds.

Verse 9:8 is the conclusion of the Healing of the Paralytic pericope (Mt 9:1-8 // Mk 2:1-12 // Lk 5:17-26).²⁵⁸ The account contains some significant departures from the text of Mark, including the omission of 7b and, in verse 8, the change of Mark's direct speech into indirect speech.²⁵⁹ And though he has retained Mark's δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν, the grounds for glorifying God are different.²⁶⁰ What then are the grounds in Matthew? Some have argued that, as with Mark's account, the miracle itself prompted the crowds' outburst—not their perception of Jesus' ability to forgive sins.²⁶¹ This seems unlikely though, both because of the deliberate repetition of ἐξουσία from v.6, and because φοβέομαι, being used of no other healings, might here indicate a more profound sort of awe.²⁶²

It appears, therefore, that it is Jesus' authority which prompts their reaction. Having said this, it is not clear that the crowds have a distinct picture of who he is. As it stands, the τοῖς ἀνθρώποις would make Jesus *primus inter pares*—one among perhaps many similarly gifted men.²⁶³ Schenk has attempted to argue that the dative here ought to be seen as a *dativus commodi*, so that Jesus' authority is given *on behalf*

235.

²⁵⁸ For a recent discussion of the pericope with special reference to Mark see H. J. Klauck, "Die Frage der Sündenvergebung in der Perikope von der Heilung des Gelähmten (Mk 2,1-12 par)" *BZ (NF)* 25 (1981) 223-248 (on Mt 246-247).

²⁵⁹ On the first of these changes cf. Klauck, "Frage" 246. On the relative infrequency of the second see Sanders, *Tendencies*, 256-262.

²⁶⁰ In Mark it is because οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν (2:12).

²⁶¹ Thus Gaechter, *Matthäus* 289; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 169; Schniewind, *Matthäus*, 118.

²⁶² Allen, *St. Matthew*, 88 describes it as "more appropriate to the forgiveness of sins". On the repeated use of ἐξουσία, Held, *TIM*, 176. See also Trilling, *St. Matthew* I, 160.

²⁶³ See Strecker, *Weg*, 221. One should not see a qualification of the Son of Man in τοῖς ἀνθρώποις—cf. Langrange, *Saint Matthieu*, 179; Held, *TIM*, 273.

of men,²⁶⁴ but his proposal is, in Thyen's words, "höchst unwahrscheinlich".²⁶⁵ This being so, it cannot be said that their attitude expresses anything more than admiration for Jesus. They have recognized something laudable and they praise God for it.

At this point, however, one must recognize with Strecker that it is difficult to confine verse 8 to the time of Jesus.²⁶⁶ A great number of scholars argue that 8b is an indication of the Church's authority to forgive sins,²⁶⁷ a theme developed explicitly elsewhere in Matthew (cp. 16:17-19 and 18:15-18). If τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, therefore, is to be interpreted entirely in terms of the Church, then the remarks made above obviously do not apply. On the other hand, it is more than likely that Matthew gave the crowds a remark that would apply to their ostensible historical context as well as his own time.

The second δοξάζω passage is 15:31, the final verse of a Matthean summary passage loosely based on Mark 7:31-37.²⁶⁸ There are very considerable differences between the two. Matthew changes the content and has once again changed the remark made by the crowd in Mark to indirect discourse.²⁶⁹ In doing this however it is clear that he has enhanced the crowds' portrayal. He has eliminated Mark's banal and slightly foolish καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκεν (Mk 7:37) and given emphasis to his own crowds' exclamation - ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραήλ by placing it at the end of the summary. He has also stressed the considered nature of their reply by separating

²⁶⁴ Wolfgang Schenk, "Den Menschen Mt 9:8" ZNW 54 (1963) 272-275.

²⁶⁵ Hartwig Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970) 243. His view is to be preferred, even though W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann, *Matthew*, AB 26 (New York: Doubleday, 1971) 103, do consider Schenk's view to be possible.

²⁶⁶ Strecker, *Weg*, 221.

²⁶⁷ Among others see: Beare, *Matthew*, 223-224; Bultmann, *HST*, 16; Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, 135; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 217 #113; B. Gerhardsson, *The Mighty Acts of Jesus According to Matthew*, Scripta Minora: Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 1978-79 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979) 76; Klauck, "Frage", 247; Herbert Leroy, *Zur Vergebung der Sünden: Die Botschaft der Evangelien*, SBS 73 (Stuttgart: KBW, 1974) 57; Barnabas Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (London: SPCK, 1983) 46 "may well be"; Schweizer, *Matthew* 224; Thompson, "Reflections", 376; Thyen, *Studien*, 242.

²⁶⁸ On the summary see Ryan, "Summary", 31-42; and Donaldson, *Mountain*, 122-135.

²⁶⁹ Matthew's use of indirect discourse both here and at 9:8 is puzzling. It may represent a desire to downplay the crowds' reactions, but a more likely explanation is that he does it for the sake of simplicity. Verse 9:8 and 15:31, especially, would be awkward to render in direct speech, whereas the indirect speech in these instances is both economical and less ungainly.

θεραπεύω from δοξάζω with a long list of Jesus' mighty works. Finally, the absolute character of their praise, that is, praise without qualification (as opposed to 9:8), suggests a quality of reverence.

Nonetheless, a caveat has to be issued. As Murphy O'Connor has argued "... glorification of God [is] not to be equated as acceptance of the person of Jesus".²⁷⁰ This, too, emerges with particular clarity in the changes Matthew has made to Mark. Beare acutely observes that in Mark the crowds praise Jesus, but in Matthew they praise God.²⁷¹ Nor can it even be argued that reverence or faith in Jesus need be implicit in this praise. This is made quite clear in the Sermon on the Mount—"Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good words and give glory (δοξάσωσιν) to your Father who is in heaven" (5:16 no //).

Finally, while Isaiah 35:5 underlies Matthew's account, it is not indicated that the crowds are aware of this fulfillment of prophecy. If Ryan is correct,²⁷² the purpose of the summary is to contrast the attitude of the crowds with that of the Pharisees. The Pharisees honour God with their lips (15:8), the crowds with their hearts. If this is true, then this pericope puts the crowds in a distinctly favourable light. Yet having said that, it appears as though Matthew has deliberately refrained from relating their attitude to Jesus. They do not worship him, but God, and their predisposition, though in itself laudable, stops short of any sign of commitment or of faith in Jesus. This judgement is in some measure confirmed by the fact that the disciples never give glory (δοξάζω) to either God or Jesus—instead they worship Jesus (προσκυνέω 14:33; 28:17—a word not used of the crowds).²⁷³

These results prompt two observations. The first concerns the nature of these actions. It has to be said that with the exception of δοξάζω the above words cannot be described as indicating either an unambiguously positive or negative response.²⁷⁴

²⁷⁰ Murphy O'Connor, "Structure", #44, p. 377 cont'd from 376.

²⁷¹ Beare, *Matthew*, 346.

²⁷² Ryan, "Summary", 39-42, esp. 38.

²⁷³ It should be remarked before concluding these word studies that Matthew has completely omitted all Mark's references to θαμβέομαι Mk 1:27 // Lk 4:36 (θάμβος); Mk 10:24 (disciples); 10:32 (disciples? crowds?).

²⁷⁴ Pace: O. Perels for instance, who speaking of this type of reaction in the synoptic

Rather, they depict a preliminary response that could, depending on the beholder, either lead to faith or away from it. In the case of the crowds, the gospel suggests a movement towards a favourable reaction. As the use of $\delta\omicron\varsigma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ reveals, they find in Jesus' acts cause for giving thanks to God, even if it cannot be said that they find God in Jesus.

The second observation is that the disciples tend to be differentiated from the crowds. The fact that they do not commonly manifest these reactions (or could be rebuked for it when they did) suggests that Matthew sees these reactions as inappropriate for disciples. Instead, particularly in his elimination of these features from Mark, he wishes to demonstrate that the disciples know who Jesus is. In short, they understand, and their worship of Jesus arises out of this understanding.

4f. *The Responses in Direct Speech*

At two points in the first gospel, the astonishment of the crowd provokes outbursts recorded in direct speech (9:32-34; 12:22-24). The broad similarities between the two passages suggest that they are doublets which have been reworked by Matthew.²⁷⁵

The form of both pericopae is, not surprisingly, similar. Jesus is brought a dumb (or dumb and blind 12:22) demoniac whom he heals so that the man speaks (or speaks and sees 12:22). At this the crowds marvel ($\epsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\mu\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ 9:33 $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ 12:23) and say "Never was anything like this seen in Israel" (9:33) and "Can this be the

gospels states that "Alle diese Gefühle sind als positive Stellung zu Jesu Tat oder Wort anzusehen" (*Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihrem Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung*, BWANT 12, (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934) 27 #6. He is also quoted with approval by H. Van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus* NovTSup VIII (Leiden: Brill, 1965) who offers brief notes on the various words discussed above, 129, notes #2-7.

²⁷⁵ See Bultmann, *HST* 212; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 32 #4; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 120 #52; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 279. With Lührmann it is preferable to regard them as developments of a traditional passage standing in Q which also had agreements with Mark (*Redaktion*, 32). For the purposes of this discussion it is not important which of the doublets is more original, though Burger, *Jesus als Davidsson: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht: 1970) 77, holds that 9:32ff. is closer to Luke 11:14 than 12:22ff. (So too Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 216-217; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 279) Burger also correctly (contra Bultmann, *HST*, 212) maintains that 9:34, which is disputed (omitted D a k sy^s Hil) ought to be viewed as an integral part of the text (*Davidsson*, 76-77). This is also Metzger's position (*Textual*, 25-26), who points out that it is needed to prepare the reader for 10:25.

Son of David?" (12:23). Both remarks elicit immediate and derogatory replies from the Pharisees to the effect that he casts out demons by the prince of demons (9:34, 12:24).

The first of these remarks probably owes its origin to Mark 2:12(c) (λέγοντας ὅτι οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν) which Matthew omitted from the healing of the paralytic pericope in favour of the saying about authority to men (9:8). As is readily seen, Matthew's version is substantially similar—οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ (9:33), while the additional reference to Israel is highly typical of Matthew.²⁷⁶

As far as the content of the utterance is concerned, it is not far removed from the reactions described above. It simply indicates the extent of their amazement. And like most of their reactions (excepting 9:8), it concentrates on the healing itself, and not on the one performing the healing.²⁷⁷ This is well brought out by the Pharisee's rejoinder which concentrates on Jesus' therapeutic activity—ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (9:34).²⁷⁸ If, therefore, there is a christological interest here, it is certainly, as Held observes, a veiled one.²⁷⁹

This cannot be said of the crowds' second exclamation (12:23).²⁸⁰ The crowds' interest has shifted from the activity of Jesus to Jesus himself, and Burger is certainly correct when he perceives "eine deutlich Steigerung"²⁸¹ between this pericope and 9:32-34. The crowds appear to be moving toward some sort of christological awareness. It remains to ask, however, how much of an awareness. Some commentators have understood their question—Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαυίδ; as tantamount to an explicit identification.²⁸² On the other hand, the force of the μή has

²⁷⁶ On the Mattheanisms in this verse cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 179. Trilling, *Wahre*, 133, remarks that "liebte Matthäus solche voll klingende biblische Ausdruck". In note 62, he observes that of Matthew's references to Israel, one is from Mark (Mt 27:42), two are from Q(8:10; 19:28) and nine are from Matthew's *Sondergut*. See in addition the remarks by Schweizer, *Matthew*, 231-32.

²⁷⁷ Hill, *Matthew*, 181.

²⁷⁸ Their retort at 12:21, by contrast, puts οὗτος in an emphatic position thus confirming that the attention there is focused on Jesus.

²⁷⁹ Held, *TIM*, 248 #2.

²⁸⁰ This verse is probably composed by Matthew. See Fuchs, *Sprachliche*, 97: "die gesamte Frage Mt 12:23 von Mt formuliert ist". See too, Burger, *Davidssohn*, 79. Against this view cf. E. Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966) 151-152.

²⁸¹ Burger, *Davidssohn*, 78. See too, Held, *TIM* 248 #2.

²⁸² Burger, *Davidssohn*, 77-79 "... die Menge ... ihn selbst als den Davidssohn erkennt". See too Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 118-119; Sand, *Gesetz*, 146.

sometimes been pressed, so that the crowds' question could be understood to anticipate the answer "No".²⁸³ The most satisfactory position, however, lies somewhere between these extremes. Certainly the μή should not be ignored, yet it does not always suggest a categorical no, nor anticipate a negative answer (cf. John 4:29).²⁸⁴ Here it ought to be regarded as indicating a "fragende Vermutung".²⁸⁵ Jesus' healing has astonished them and led them to broach the question of whether he might be the Son of David. The question is only broached, however; at this point it cannot be said that the crowds know who Jesus is. Rather, they are struggling towards this knowledge.²⁸⁶

In addition to the content of these pericopae, the context of both is also significant. In each case, the view of the crowds is juxtaposed with the negative judgement of the Pharisees. Held and Van Tilborg have rightly observed that Matthew's intention is not to emphasize the healing as such, but the "two-fold reaction of the Pharisees and the multitude which in both cases is brought to expression in a quotation".²⁸⁷ This is particularly vivid at 12:22-24 where Matthew has introduced deliberate parallelism. Van Tilborg has noted how the Pharisees' response to the crowds οὗτος ... εἰ μή directly echoes the crowds' μήτι οὗτός.²⁸⁸ Such an effect serves to stress the virtually antithetical disparity between the two views. The effect, of course, is both to blacken the portrait of the Pharisees and enhance the depiction of the crowds.²⁸⁹ Thus, when both the content and context of the above pericopae are

²⁸³ See Kingsbury, "Verb", 61.

²⁸⁴ See *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, F. Blass and A. Debrunner, tr./rev. R. W. Funk, of 9/10 German ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1961) (hereafter *BDF*) 427:2; Moulton, *Grammar*, III 283; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 3rd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919) 917.

²⁸⁵ The phrase is Alfred Suhl's "Der Davidsohn im Matthäus-Evangelium", *ZNW* 59 (1968) 57-81, 72. Cf. in addition cf. H. Balz, "μήτι, *EWNT* II, col. 1049, "veilleicht am Ende"; Dennis C. Duling, "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic" *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 392-410, 401; J. M. Gibbs, "Purpose", 458; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 328-329; Haenchen, *Weg*, 137; Lagrange, *Saint Matthieu*, 241; McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 174; Trilling, *St. Matthew*, I, 225; Lohse ("υἱὸς Δαυὶδ" *TDNT* 8, 478-488) has "inkling of the truth" ("ahnenden Begreifens" *TWNT* 8 490-91).

²⁸⁶ Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 74; *pace* Kingsbury; "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel" *JBL* 95 (1976) 591-602, 600.

²⁸⁷ Held, *TIM*, 247. Cf. Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 143-145.

²⁸⁸ Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 145.

²⁸⁹ Characteristically, Matthew makes it the Pharisees who dispute with the crowds. In Mark, it is the scribes from Jerusalem (3:22) and in Luke "some of the multitude" (11:14-15 ... καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι, τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον κτλ). Edwards (R. A. Edwards, *The Sign of Jonah*

considered, a favourable picture emerges, one which suggests that the crowds, if they have not yet penetrated the question of Jesus' identity, are at least on the right track.

Conclusion

To conclude, one has to say that the above passages disclose something of an incipient, favourable response to Jesus on the part of the crowds. While the verbs of amazement display nothing of this, the use of *δοξάζω* of the crowds and the remarks that they make support this contention. In addition, the variety of their responses may indicate something of a progression in their awareness. The shift, for instance, from a concern about the miracle (9:33) to an interest in the doer of the miracle (12:23) suggests this, as does the movement from 9:8—thaumaturge to 12:23—(perhaps) the Son of David. In any case, their openness to Jesus is clearly demonstrated, not least, when it is contrasted with the Pharisees' intransigence. On the other hand, when their attitude is composed with that of the disciples a marked difference also emerges. In general, the disciples are not overcome with wonder in the face of Jesus' words and deeds. For them this preliminary reaction has been superseded by understanding, and by worship of Jesus. It is clearly the disciples who have faith in Jesus and worship him, not the crowds. This latter possibility does not necessarily appear to be denied the crowds, but there is nonetheless a gulf fixed between the disciples and them, just as there is between the Pharisees and them. In this respect, one might say that Matthew has described a spectrum of reactions to Jesus' words and deeds—the Pharisees situated at one side, the disciples at the other, while the *ὄχλοι* occupy the middle.

It remains to ask why Matthew has represented the crowds in this light. As with *ἀκολουθέω*, one clear reason is christological. The *ὄχλοι* act as a foil to Jesus' words and deeds. Their astonishment, fear and glorification of God continually emphasize the extraordinary and unprecedented character of Jesus' deeds. They function as naïve witnesses to his messianic actions.²⁹⁰

in *The Theology of The Evangelist and Q*, SBT, 2 ser. 18 (London: SCM, 1971) goes so far as to say that here they become "a type of the anti-disciple" (101-102).

²⁹⁰ Their naïve standpoint might also play a part in the evangelistic intent of the gospel.

Once again, there is also an apologetic tendency. The crowds' adulation stresses the quondam favourable reaction of the Jewish crowds to Jesus, and their onetime amazement at his actions. Of a piece with this, is the anti-Pharisaic polemic which reveals the Pharisees' wilful misunderstanding and their deliberate attempts to subvert the crowds. (It is not for nothing the crowds are included at the beginning of Chapter 23.) Although still *in nuce* here, the argument being developed places the blame for the crowds' failure to understand clearly on the Pharisee's shoulders.

Because the crowds occupy the middle point in the spectrum, an uncommitted hearer (or reader) of the gospel would readily identify with them. The crowds react to Jesus' miracles (in distinction to the disciples and the Pharisees) just as "everyman" would—with astonishment. Once the hearer occupied this position though he would realize that (within the gospel framework, at least) it was not tenable. Either the Pharisees were right, or the disciples were. Given these two options the gospel indicates quite clearly the logic of the second alternative.

5. JESUS' MINISTRY TO THE CROWDS

In general, Jesus' activity amongst the crowds can be epitomized by the summaries Matthew himself furnishes at 4:23 and 9:35 (cf. 11:1)—"teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom and healing every disease and infirmity".²⁹¹

5a. κηρύσσω

Of these three elements, preaching by Jesus (apart from the above summaries) only transpires at the inception of Jesus' ministry (4:17 // John the Baptist 3:1-2 and the disciples 10:7; 27; 24:14; 26:13).²⁹² The substance of the proclamation is described as either, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (4:17, cf. 3:2; 10:7), or "the gospel of the Kingdom" (4:23; 9:35). Its purport is to signal the advent of the eschatological activity of God—it approaches its hearers and demands a response of them.²⁹³ In this respect it could be regarded as preparatory, or as Guelich aptly terms it, as "heralding" the activity of God in the person of Jesus.²⁹⁴ This would explain why it is used to describe the Baptist's activity, and why after 11:1 it is no longer used of Jesus.²⁹⁵ It may also explain why Matthew has omitted Mark 1:38 - ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον. In Matthew, preaching is simply not as programmatic an activity for Jesus as it is in Mark - instead, teaching and healing have been accorded more emphasis.

As Jesus' preaching in Matthew is, by its very nature, a global activity, the crowds are included in a general sense amongst his audience. This is made clear by 4:23 with 4:25; in 4:23 (cf. 9:36) Jesus went about ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, while 4:25

²⁹¹ As the components of Jesus' ministry have been discussed frequently, the following discussion will be cursory, and confine itself to the keywords of Matthew's editorial summaries - preaching, teaching, and healing. Bultmann, (*HST* 355), includes these among the "editorial comments which Matthew adds to Mark", so too Allen, *Matthew* liii; Gerhardsson, *Mighty* 22-24. It is not clear how explicitly these summaries refer to the crowds. In the case of both however, the crowds are alluded to immediately afterwards either as following him (4:25) or being present (9:36 cf. 11:6) which rather suggests that their presence might be understood as a response to Jesus' actions.

²⁹² On κηρύσσω see Helmut Flender, "Lehren und Verkündigung in den synoptischen Evangelien", *EvT* 25 (1965) 701-14, 704-6; G. Friedrich "κηρύξω κτλ" *TDNT* III 683-718; F. Hahn, *Mission*, Luz, *Matthew* 1-7, 206-8.

²⁹³ Kretzer *Herrschaft*, 263.

²⁹⁴ Guelich, *Sermon*, 45.

²⁹⁵ In Mark it is not used of Jesus after 1:39.

describes the crowds as following him ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλαλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως κτλ. The obvious inference is that the crowds were recipients of the activity described in 4:23. That the crowds never expressly respond to Jesus' preaching is a feature Matthew has in common with Mark. It makes sense, however, since Jesus' teaching and healing help to elucidate what is meant by the inbreaking of the Kingdom.

5b. διδάσκω

Teaching is the next element of the triad,²⁹⁶ and seems to delineate the type and the quality of the response that is required of the one who heeds the proclamation. Since preaching and teaching are interrelated, it has to be asked whether it the two should be distinguished.²⁹⁷ Allison and Davies argue that a distinction is unnecessary, since both "have as their content the Messiah's words and deeds".²⁹⁸ Strictly speaking, however, this is not always the case, as 4:3 and 4:17 make clear; Jesus can hardly be equated with the Kingdom, even though his advent signals its arrival. In fact, the arrival of the Kingdom may well be the substance of "the good news of the Kingdom" proclaimed at 4:23; 9:35 and 10:7.²⁹⁹ In any case, Davies and Allison pay insufficient attention to the preparatory quality of preaching. That Matthew intends to distinguish teaching from preaching can also be seen in the fact that in both of the above summaries Jesus is described as teaching in synagogues. Friedrich has noted that while Jesus'

²⁹⁶ On teaching (διδάσκω) see, among others, Bornkamm, *TIM*, 38#1; Dupont, "Chapitre", 250-59; Flender, "Lehren", 704-6; Guelich, *Sermon*, 43-44; Kingsbury, *Thirteen*, 28-29; Lange, *Erscheinen*, 316-19; Friedrich Normann, *Christos Didaskalos: Die Vorstellung von Christos als Lehrer in der christlichen Literatur des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts* Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 32, (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967), *passim*; K.H. Rengstorff "διδάσκω κτλ" *TDNT* II 135-65; Rainer Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer*, 3 Auf. WUNT II.7 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981, 1988); Strecker, *Weg* 126-28; F. Van Segbroeck, "Jésus rejeté par sa patrie", *Bib* 49 (1968) 167-98, 174-77.

²⁹⁷ Strecker, *Weg*, 127, does recognize a distinction but argues that it is not a deep seated one—"die Differenzierung nicht ständig durchgehalten ist". He contends that 7:24ff demonstrates an "Entscheidungsruf" even though it is located in a section which is avowedly teaching. This may be so, but his choice of example is suspect. For one thing, 7:24 // is a parable and not teaching *per se* (cf. 13:3). Second, it clearly functions as a coda to the teaching which has preceded it—ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους and is therefore not of the same fabric. Strecker's other arguments also fail to convince.

²⁹⁸ Allison and Davies, *Matthew*, 415.

²⁹⁹ "Matthew particularly points out the content of the gospel ... This had already come in with the Baptist, who was the first to proclaim the nearness of the eschatological reign of God. Jesus took up this message and carried it further; but he was not merely, like John, a man who prepared the way, for with him the fulfilment of the Old Testament promises has come." Hahn, *Mission*, 122.

teaching usually took place in the synagogue, his proclamation transpired anywhere in the open.³⁰⁰

Having said this, it is apparent the two are related. Preaching calls individuals to repentance and to life, while teaching specifies the way of life.³⁰¹ This is particularly the case in Matthew where, as Bornkamm has effectively shown, διδάσκω is related to the exposition of the law.³⁰² Dupont has shown on the basis of 5:19 ("Whoever the relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven."), that the law is the object of teaching.³⁰³ Teaching, therefore, makes the demands of God explicit for men.

It is evident that the crowds are recipients of Jesus' teaching. Do they however continue to be recipients? Recently this assumption has been called into question by J.D. Kingsbury and several others.³⁰⁴ It has been argued that Chapter 13 is the "turning point" of the gospel after which Jesus withdraws from the crowds and no longer teaches or preaches to them.

While this view is plausible at first glance, it does not hold up to detailed scrutiny. It is certainly true that references to Jesus' teaching are not so numerous as in Mark³⁰⁵ but Matthew gives no reason to suppose that Jesus has ceased teaching the crowds. For example, in the passages just treated above (7:28: 22:33) the crowds repeat almost verbatim at 22:33 the exclamation they had made at 7:28. As Matthew

³⁰⁰ Friedrich, "κῆρυξ", 713 of the synoptic gospels. This observation holds well for Matthew. Jesus teaches in synagogues at 4:23, 9:35; 13:54 and also the temple 21:23; 22:16; 26:55. At 11:1 he teaches ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν which may reflect an abbreviation of the two previous summaries. The one obvious exception is the Sermon on the Mount, though one might argue that this was situated on a mountain to bring out the Mosaic parallels. Allison and Davies (*Matthew* 415#6) argue that, in addition to his teaching, Jesus' preaching and healing at 4:23 ought to be confined to the synagogue as well. Such an interpretation hardly does justice to the sense of the sentence nor to Matthew's redaction. See his alteration of Mk 1:39, where Jesus' "preaching in their synagogues" is changed to "teaching in their synagogues".

³⁰¹ Luz, *Matthew* 1-7, 208.

³⁰² Bornkamm, "End-Expectation" 38 #1 (followed by C.E. Carlston, "The Things That Defile" (Mark VII.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark" *NTS* 15 (1968) 75-96, 83#6; Dupont, "Chapitre" 255; Hahn, *Mission*, 121; Lange *Erscheinen*, 316f.; Normann, *Didaskalos* 26.

³⁰³ Dupont, "Chapitre", 253-54.

³⁰⁴ See J.D. Kingsbury, *Thirteen*, 29; Leon-Dufour, *Études* 236-237; Comber, "Verb", 431; Ellis, *Matthew*, 60; Van Segbroeck, "Scandale", 272.

³⁰⁵ On Matthew's changes to Mark see Lange, *Erscheinen*, 316-317.

has not hesitated to remove Mark's statements about the crowds when they did not suit him³⁰⁶ his inclusion of this passage is surprising indeed if Kingsbury's surmise is correct.³⁰⁷ Nor is this a solitary example. At 21:23 Matthew has actually added διδάσκοντι to his account.³⁰⁸ That the crowds comprised at least part of the audience is evident from the leaders' manifest fear of them at 21:26—φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον. It is also seen at 26:55 where Jesus addresses the crowds which have come to arrest him—"Day after day I sat in the temple teaching, and you did not seize me". This passage is based on Mk 14:49 except that Matthew has Jesus speak expressly τοῖς ὄχλοις.³⁰⁹ These references, therefore, suggest that Jesus is depicted as teaching the crowds up to the very end of his ministry.³¹⁰ Kingsbury does attempt to discount or justify these references. He argues that:

... even though the word itself occurs in several instances where Jesus is engaged in discussion with Jews, it is never used positively in the sense that Matthew provides us with an elaboration of the message of Jesus (cf. 5:2; 7:28), nor does it ever appear in a situation where the Jews seem receptive to him. On the contrary, this term either finds its place in the scenic framework of a pericope (13:54, 21:23, 22:16, 26:55), or is employed negatively in a denunciation of Jewish doctrine (11:9, cf. 16:22), or occurs where there is a debate with Jews who are manifestly obdurate already (13:54, 22:16).³¹¹

This is surely specious argumentation. In response to his first point, it must be

³⁰⁶ Cf. Mk 12:37b and 7:37 (though the latter is not explicitly said of the crowds) and the references to the crowd following Jesus in the account of Jairus' daughter—5:24, 27, 30, 31.

³⁰⁷ Kingsbury's explanation that 22:33 "merely demonstrates that Jesus had the last word over his opponents" *Parable* 29, fails to address the issue.

³⁰⁸ Not found in Mark (11:27) or // Lk 20:1. The διδάσκοντι is missing in a few authorities (7 it sy^{s.c.} Or P^h) which has led Van Segbroeck, "Patrie" 175 #4 to account for it as an harmonization of Lk 20:1. Such a conjecture fails to recognize, in Dupont's words, "le témoignage quasi unanime de la tradition textuelle". "Chapitre" 253 #76.

³⁰⁹ This may also have been added for the sake of clarity—see B. Weiss, *Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lukas-Parallelen* (Halle-Verlag: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1876) 555.

³¹⁰ Cf. Meier, *Law* 28 #9, "Jesus is presented as *teaching* from the very beginning to the very end of his public ministry" (italics his) and Keegan "Formulae" 419. Another example of Jesus' teaching ministry can be seen at 22:16 when the disciples of the Herodians and Pharisees say "You teach the way of God in truth" no Mkn // cf. Lk 20:21ff. As the context and setting are the same as those at 21:26 the crowds form part of the audience here as well.

³¹¹ Kingsbury, *Parables*, 29.

asked whether Matthew needs to give yet another elaboration of Jesus' teaching after the extensive one he has already provided in the three chapters of the Sermon on the Mount. Second, Kingsbury discounts all references to teaching because they do not appear in contexts where the "Jews" are receptive to Jesus. This however refutes Kingsbury's own argument. It indicates that Jesus has not turned away from "the Jews" at all, but if anything (by Kingsbury's account) they have turned away from him and his teaching. Lastly, what does he mean by "scenic framework of a pericope"? Are not 5:2 and 7:28, for instance, equally scenic? The questionable nature of Kingsbury's procedure emerges when one realizes that he has to discount virtually half of the references to Jesus' teaching in Matthew.³¹² Instead, it is better to recognize that Matthew has chosen to emphasize Jesus' teaching at different points in his gospel. Jesus confronts the crowds with the demands of the law, not just for a part of his ministry, but for all of it. Such an approach intimates that the crowds are capable, when confronted with the moment of crisis, of choosing to adhere to Jesus' διδασχῇ. A similar impression is afforded by Matthew's calculated inclusion of the crowds as part of the audience of the Sermon on the Mount. While the Jewish leaders are also, at various points, auditors of Jesus' teaching (21:23; 22:16; 22:33 with 22:23), the fact that they are not present for the Sermon on the Mount is noteworthy. It means that Jesus treats the crowds here in exactly the same manner he treats his disciples, since this is the only time where the disciples are explicitly said to be taught by Jesus.

Of course, this depiction is not without irony. Jesus' triste remarks at 26:55 are evocative, while the amazement of the Pharisees when faced with Jesus' teaching (22:22) is not far removed from the astonishment of the crowds at 22:33. As was argued above, these states are but preludes to faith, and the very fact that 22:33 is largely the same as 7:28 indicates that if Jesus' teaching ministry to the crowds remained constant, so too did their response.

The third verb of the summaries, θεραπεύω, also plays a significant role in the

³¹² 4:23; 5:2; 7:28,29; 9:35; 11:1 vs. 13:54; 21:23; 22:16; 22:33; 26:55. See further the discussion by Dupont, "Chapitre", #82, 255-256.

ministry of Jesus in the First Gospel,³¹³ being found more frequently in Matthew than in the other synoptic gospels.³¹⁴ Unlike secular Greek, the word has no implications of service as such, but always refers to healing as is indicated by its frequent association with νόσος and μαλακία (4:23; 9:35; 10:1; cf. 8:17) and other related expressions. Jesus' healing, like the feeding of the crowds, is also associated with Matthew's use of σπλαγνίζομαι.³¹⁵ At 14:14 his compassion leads to his healing of the crowds. Additionally, at 9:36, it impels him to commission the disciples so that they too, can requite the needs of the crowds.³¹⁶

5c. θεραπεύω

The verb θεραπεύω in Matthew's gospel is more directly related to the crowds than either κηρύσσω or διδάσκω. While Jesus is described as healing individuals four times³¹⁷ he heals the crowds some eight times, and many of these instances have been introduced by Matthew.³¹⁸ More significantly, he twice replaces Mark's

³¹³ On θεραπεύω see Beyer *EWNT* II s.v.; Comber, "Verb", 431-34.

³¹⁴ Mt 16 Mk 5 Lk 14. The verb ἰάομαι occurs less frequently. Apart from the *Reflexionszitat* at 13:15, it occurs three times in the passive (8:8,13; 15:28) to indicate that an individual was (or would be) healed. Schenk, *Sprache*, observes that Matthew appears to be making a conscious distinction between ἰάομαι and θεραπεύω here, because, apart from the *Reflexionszitat* at 13:15, the other references to ἰάομαι are only applied to the healing of gentiles. (8:8 is probably derived from Q, while 8:13 and 15:28 are without parallel.)

³¹⁵ On σπλαγνίζομαι see Koester "σπλάγγνον" *TDNT* VII, 548-549 and N. Walter "σπλάγγνον" *EWNT* III cols. 633-634. The verb occurs in Mt at 9:36; 14:14 (// Mk 6:34); 15:32 (// Mk 3:2); 18:27; 20:34.

³¹⁶ At 20:34 it is used of Jesus' healing of the two blind men (20:29-34), while at 15:32 his compassion leads to his feeding of the crowds. The word also occurs in the parable of the unforgiving servant (18:37).

³¹⁷ 8:8; 12:20; 12:22; 17:18.

³¹⁸ These eight instances include the summaries at 4:23 and 9:35.

4:23 θεραπεύω has been added.

4:24 no // (cf. Lk 6:18)

8:16 // Mk 1:34; Lk 4:40

9:35 θεραπεύω added

12:15 // Mk 3:10; Lk 6:18

14:14 no Mk // cf. Lk 9:11

15:30 no //s being an expansion of Mark's account of the healing of the deaf mute (7:31-37)

19:2 no //s

Of individuals: 8:7 no //s

12:10 // Mk 3:2; Lk 6:7

12:22 - θεραπεύω added, cf. Lk. 11:14

17:18 θεραπεύω added cf. Lk 9:42.

references to Jesus teaching the crowds by references to him healing the crowds. At Mark 6:24 the compassion of Jesus results in Jesus' teaching the crowds, while in Matthew it results in his healing their sick. Again in the pericope of the departure to Judea Matthew changes Mark's "and he taught them again as he was accustomed" (Mk 10:1) to "and he healed them there" (19:2). This may reflect Matthew's desire to downplay the overabundant use of διδάσκω in Mark,³¹⁹ but is more likely a reflection of Matthew's desire to emphasize Jesus' healing ministry to the crowds. This seems all the more probable when it is recognized that Matthew has fashioned a healing summary at 15:29-31³²⁰ which is clearly reminiscent of the Sermon on the Mount. Once again Jesus climbs a mountain and sits down, but instead of the disciples approaching, it is the crowds who come and bring their sick. Like the Sermon on the Mount it concludes with amazement on the part of the crowds (15:31 cf. 7:28), but more significantly with their praise of the God of Israel.

Notwithstanding these changes, Strecker³²¹ and Hübner³²² following him, have argued that teaching has primacy over healing in the gospel. Strecker maintains that "Obwohl das Wunderwirken Jesu ausdrücklich hervorgehoben wird . . . erhält es kein Eigengewicht". His position prompts several remarks. First, given the extent of Matthew's editorial additions, what basis does Strecker have for claiming that it has no "Eigengewicht"? His discussion of only one passage (7:22-23 a passage not found in the narrative proper) hardly substantiates his remarks about "das Wunderwirken Jesu". Theissen's remarks offer more of a balanced corrective: "Nor [in Matthew] is there any sign of a general subordination of miracle to word. The programmatic miracle summary in 4:23-25 precedes the Sermon on the Mount. In it teaching and healing are

³¹⁹ Lange, (*Erscheinen*, 317) argues that this reflects Matthew's desire to neutralize Mark's "inflationistischen, theologisch unerheblichen Gebrauch von διδάσκειν".

³²⁰ Mt omits Mk's healing of the deaf-mute (7:21-27) perhaps because of its 'magical' features (generally downplayed by Matthew), or its similarity to 9:32-34 (cf. Donaldson, *Mountain*, 260 #30). In any case, Fenton, *St. Matthew*, 257 is probably correct that Mk's use of the uncommon μνηστῆρα (7:32) recalled Is 35:5f to Matthew and led him to fashion a healing summary based upon it.

³²¹ Strecker, *Weg* 175-177.

³²² Hans Hübner, *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition*, 2. Aufl., [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986] 200-201.

linked. What Matthew has joined, let not the exegete put asunder".³²³

Yet one cannot not help wonder if Strecker and Hübner are not creating a false dichotomy here. When Strecker suggests that miracle-working has no "Eigengewicht", the question arises, "Eigengewicht" for whom? For the church? For the crowds? He seems oblivious to the question of audience here, but that is really the decisive question. For the disciples (and church), teaching would quite naturally assume prominence, but in the case of the crowds, healing is more weighty.

This understanding helps to explain the magnitude and scope of Matthew's editorial changes. It is not his concern about the over-use of διδάσκω that prompts his changes, but a concern to show Jesus healing his people. It is for this reason that the Sermon on the Mount is preceded by Matthean accounts of Jesus healing the crowds.³²⁴ It is for the same reason that, in Matthew, Jesus' triumphal entry with the crowds concludes with him healing in the Temple (21:14). It is this same reason again which impels Matthew to create an analogue to the Sermon on the Mount, which is devoted solely to Jesus' healing ministry of the crowds.

That this reflects a very calculated development on Matthew's part can be demonstrated by the reactions he attributes to the crowds. For one thing, the nature of the crowds' response is different for healings than it is for teaching. It was just noted that the crowds are described as responding to Jesus' teaching twice in a rather formalized fashion - οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο [οἱ ὄχλοι 7:28] ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκῇ αὐτοῦ (22:33). In the case of healings, two of the crowds' utterances are recorded in direct speech (9:32-34; 12:22-24), a feature which makes the responses more vivid. Even the responses that are not recorded in direct speech, however, are more vital because they are more varied and less formulaic. They do not show the same formalism of the above two passages. Nor is their response static. As has been mentioned before, there is a change on the part of the crowds, in the form of an increasing christological awareness - a movement from the deeds to the doer of the

³²³ Theissen, *Miracle Stories*, 207.

³²⁴ Cf. Lohfink, "Bergpredigt" 272-78.

deeds. It is certainly significant that it is healing which provokes this response in the crowds, and not Jesus' teaching.

The question then arises, why it is that the healing of the crowds receives such emphasis? The most likely answer is the assumption that Matthew and his community perceived in Jesus' healings the arrival of the Kingdom - the advent of the Messiah and his ministry to Israel.³²⁵ This is strongly suggested both by the allusions to Isaiah 35:5-6, which underly both Jesus' answer to John the Baptist and Matthew's healing summary at 15:29-31. It is also suggested by the programmatic statement at 1:21 - "for he will save his people from their sins" (Cf. Ps 130:8).³²⁶ While it is true that this passage does not expressly mention healing, the pericope of the healing of the paralytic (9:1-8) shows that the forgiveness of sins is closely allied with healing.³²⁷ Foerster remarks that the forgiveness element goes beyond contemporary Judaism because "the remission of sins is not a central theme of the Messianic salvation or deliverance."³²⁸

While the basic thrust of Foerster's contention is true, there are indications in the *Targum of Isaiah* in particular, that, in some traditions, forgiveness came to be

³²⁵ Whether these miracles, of themselves, would have suggested the arrival of the Messiah is disputed. E. P. Sanders (*Jesus*, 170 and cf. his discussion of exorcisms 134-41) claims that "there is nothing about miracles which would trigger, in the first-century Jewish world, the expectation that the end was at hand." A.E. Harvey, with whom Sanders takes issue, states that the kind of cures described in Mt 15:31 "were not merely unprecedented; they were characteristic of the new age which...was expected one way or another by the majority of the contemporaries of Jesus." (*Jesus and the Constraints of History*, (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982) 115). This problem, by its very nature, broaches the whole vexed question of Messianic Expectation, (See the standard discussions by G.F. Moore, *Judaism* II 323-76; Schürer *History* II 492-547; S.B. IV.2 857-80), a question which is becoming increasingly problematic. See the recent analysis by W.S.Green ("Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question", Introduction to J. Neusner et al., *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987) 1-13) which argues against Schürer especially, that "preoccupation with the messiah was not a uniform or definitive trait, nor a common reference point, of early Jewish writings or the Jews who produced them" (10). As in the examination of the Eschatological Prophet above, our discussion will bypass these questions and attempt to consider them primarily in the light in which Matthew appears to cast them.

³²⁶ Hans Walter Wolff, (*Jesaja im Urchristentum*, 4 Auf., (Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1984) 74) relates the *Reflexionszitat* at 8:17 to 1:21; "die Heilungen folgen aus seinem Knechtsdienst, in dem er mit der Macht der Sünde und des Todes ringt" (original italicized).

³²⁷ It should also be remarked that σῶζω can mean "free from disease" especially in the passive, cf. BAG 1c and Mt 9:21/Mk 5:28; Mt 9:22a/Mk 5:34a; Mt 9:22b no //. For the link between sin and sickness see: Jn 9:1ff.; Pss 32:3-5; 103:2-3; 1 En 95:4; Sir 38:9-11,15; 1Q GA 20:12-29; 4Q OrNab. For a discussion of the last four passages see H. C. Kee *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times*, SNTSMS 55 (Cambridge: University Press, 1986) 19-20, 24-26, 72. See, as well, B Ned 41a "A sick man does not recover from his sickness until all his sins are forgiven him", and B Meg 17b "redemption and healing come after forgiveness".

³²⁸ W. Foerster et al., "σῶζω κτλ" *TDNT* VII 965-1024,991.

associated with the Messiah,³²⁹ the Servant of the Lord, even if the Messiah is merely an intercessor and does not himself forgive. The reformulation of Isaiah 53:4 is particularly vivid: "*Then he will beseech concerning our sins and our iniquities for his sake will be forgiven ; yet we were esteemed wounded, smitten before the LORD and afflicted.*" The intercessory aspect of the entire chapter is marked,³³⁰ though it is apparent that the Messiah is not a suffering servant figure. Naturally, the dating of the levels of tradition within the targum is problematic, but Chilton posits a time frame of ca. 70-135.³³¹ He avers that for the meturgeman writing after the disaster in 70, "the gospel of Jesus was not yet of sufficient concern to make him alter his interpretation for apologetic reasons, and it is permissible to infer that, in his messianic understanding of the Isaian servant, the meturgeman attests a primitive exegesis common to Judaism and Christianity."³³² If this inference is valid, then the forgiveness of sins may well have been associated with the inbreaking of the messianic age.

In any case, Matthew probably understands Jesus' therapeutic ministry to the crowds as the outworking of 1:21. The phrase, τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, is best taken as a reference to Israel.³³³ This, in turn, explains why the word Israel figures prominently in the reactions of Matthew's crowds. At 9:33 they say, "Never was anything like this seen in Israel", while at 15:31, "they glorified the God of Israel". Their references to the Son of David are to be seen in the same light, as the juxtaposition with son of Abraham at 1:1 makes clear. In this fashion, Matthew demonstrates not only that Jesus' ministry was confined to Israel,³³⁴ but that, in his ministry, scripture finds its fulfillment (Ps 130:8; Is 53:4.). The crowds function, therefore, as the naïve witnesses

³²⁹ The passages cited above refer back to the Messiah mentioned at 52:13 "Behold, my servant, *the Messiah* shall prosper...". This translation, and the ones given above, are by B. Chilton, *Targum*. The italics represent the "innovative wording" of the targum, the roman type, the rendering of the hebrew.

³³⁰ "Von allen Taten des Messias wird am nachdrücklichsten sein Wirken zur Sündenvergebung herausgestellt." K. Koch "Messias und Sündenvergebung in Jesaja 53 - Targum. Beitrag zu der Praxis der aramäischen Bibelübersetzung" *JSJ* 3 (1972) 117-48, 147.

³³¹ B. Chilton, *Glory*, 95.

³³² *Ibid.*, 94.

³³³ Luz, *Matthew* 1-7, 121. It likely refers to the Christian community at the transparent level. Interpretations like that of Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 210, which interpret τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ in light of 21:43 wrongly disregard Jesus' ministry to his own people.

³³⁴ In light of this, it is ironic that some have seen a ministry to the gentiles at 15:31!

of the Messiah's promised visitation to his people. Even if they do not ultimately recognize him, they cannot help but recognize in him, particularly in his healing, something otherwise unprecedented.

Conclusion

In the foregoing discussion of the key elements of Jesus' ministry, it was decided that, in the first gospel, preaching should be regarded as something related, but distinct from teaching. Preaching faces the individual with the approach of the Kingdom and its demands, while teaching makes the nature of these demands explicit. Healing is also an important feature in the gospel. It is of more immediate concern to the crowds than either preaching or teaching, as can be adjudged from their receptive response to it. Matthew is very likely using the responses of the crowd to demonstrate that the Messiah did in fact come to heal his people and forgive their sins, as was prophesied in the scriptures.

6. SON OF DAVID

6a. *Prelude*

The role of the crowd also comes into question with its ascription of the title "Son of David" to Jesus at 21:9. Since the christological significance of the term in Matthew is considerable,³³⁵ and continues to engender debate, it will be worth briefly touching on the term in Matthew's gospel.

The first question to settle is whether this is a distinction between "Son of David" with an article and the anarthrous "Son of David". Suhl, for one, has argued that there is a far-reaching distinction between the two: "Das stetige Vorkommen dieses Titels 'Davidssohn' mit Artikel im Munde der bei allem Jubel doch unterschiedenen

³³⁵ It occurs nine times (1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30; 20:31; 21:9; 21:15) versus three times in Mark (10:47; 10:48; 12:35) and three times in Luke (18:38; 18:39 and 20:41), none in Q. Künzel cites Proksch in saying that "kein Evangelist betont so stark wie Matthäus die Davidssohnschaft Christi" (*Gemeinde*, 76 #17). See too R. S. McConnell, *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel* (Basel, 1969) 154 on its importance in the gospel.

Menge könnte dann ein Hinweis auf ein falsches Messiasverständnis dieser Menge sein. Daß der Davidssohn-Titel etwas mit Jesus Heilen zu tun hat, beweist jedenfalls schließlich der artikellose Davidssohn-Anrede im Munde hilfeschender Glaubender in den drei genannten Heilungsgeschichten."³³⁶

Although this approach is attractive at first glance, several factors weigh against it. The first is whether Matthew really intended such a distinction. Turner remarks *à propos* of Mt 9:27 and 20:30, 31³³⁷ that υἱὸς Δαυίδ is an anarthrous because of the Hebrew construct state.³³⁸ If he is correct this reveals merely a difference of form, rather than one which is theologically motivated.

That this represents a false distinction can also be seen from the position he is forced to assume regarding the children who praise Jesus' healings at 21:15. Because they use the articular title (Ὁσσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ) Suhl has to range them with those who possess "ein falsches Messias Verständnis".³³⁹ This runs counter to the tenor of the gospel (11:25), and, more significantly, to Jesus' own acceptance of the praise at 21:16. Suhl claims this is not decisive because "läßt er [sc. Mt] hier Jesus nur zu der Tatsache des Jubelrufs, nicht aber zu seinem Inhalt Stellung nehmen."³⁴⁰ yet this is manifestly not the case. Jesus' quotation of Psalm 8 expresses a definite opinion about the children's utterance—it is "perfect praise".³⁴¹ For these reasons Suhl's argument does not hold.

This leads to the significance of the title itself.³⁴² Is it, as Trilling advocates,

³³⁶ Suhl, "Davidssohn", 73.

³³⁷ (p 45, vñe)

³³⁸ Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 34. Duling, "Therapeutic", 400 indicates some uncertainty about the semitized character of these passages. W.R.G. Loader, ("Son of David, Blindness, Possession and Duality in Matthew", *CBQ* (1982) 570-585, 571 #4) says that Suhl's argument "puts too much weight on the use or omission of the article . . . with the use of Son of God we have a similar phenomenon".

³³⁹ Suhl, "Davidssohn", 73.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 73, #42.

³⁴¹ As Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic, the Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961) rightly observes, "Though the Jewish authorities refused to acknowledge the kingship of Jesus, the 'babes' celebrated his arrival in accordance with prophecy. The acclamation of the common people is taken as evidence of the rightness of the Church's claim about Jesus, because it is they whom the psalm especially mentions as destined to acclaim the Christ" (168). For a similar point see Bornkamm, "End-Expectation and Church in Matthew" in *TIM*, 15-51, 33; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 80-81 #37 and Trilling, "Der Einzug in Jerusalem: Mt 21, 1-17" in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, hrsg. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, F. Mußner (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963) 303-309, 307.

³⁴² In addition to the articles considered below see: Bruce Chilton, "Jesus ben David;

"der von Matthäus *einzig* eindeutig messianisch verstandene Titel Jesu (außer eben χριστός selbst)"³⁴³ or a "correct but inadequate title of the Jesus of the Matthean ministry"³⁴⁴ as Brown maintains? The question does not admit of easy answers,³⁴⁵ as Matthew's portrayal does not appear monolithic to say the least. On the one hand, the genealogy emphasizes the kingship of Jesus and his place in David's royal line. On the other hand, a number of passages stress the role of Son of David as healer.

To evaluate this portrayal, the following discussion will first treat the genealogy and the Son of David question (22:41-46). In the process it will consider the so-called "Pharisaic" conception of the Son of David in Matthew's genealogy, and also determine the title's adequacy. From there it will go on to examine the "therapeutic" Son of David and its relation to κύριος. Finally, it will look at the Triumphal Entry and the crowds' use of the title at that time.

6b. *The Genealogy and the Son of David*

The title "Son of David" is an important one in Matthew's first chapter. Indeed, its significance is evident in the very first verse of the gospel, —"the book of the genealogy of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the son of Abraham" (βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαυὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ). It clearly places the title—and the other christological elements³⁴⁶ in an emphatic position with respect to the rest of the gospel.³⁴⁷ It is true that one of the designations here—son of Abraham—does not

Reflections on the *Davidssohnfrage*" *JNT* 14 (1982) 88-112; Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, tr. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1959, 1963) 127-133; Albert Descamps, "Le Messianisme Royal dans le Nouveau Testament" in L. Cerfaux et al. (eds.) *L'attente du Messie*, (Bruges: Desclées de Brouwer, 1958) 57-84, Albert Fuchs, *Sprachliche*, 94-99; H. B. Green, "Solomon the Son of David in Matthean Typology" *SE* VII, 227-230 *TU* 126 (1982); Evald Lövestam, "Jésus Fils de David chez les Synoptiques" *ST* 28 (1974) 97-109; Wilhelm Wrede, "Jesus als Davidsohn" in *Vorträge und Studien* (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1907) 147-177.

³⁴³ Trilling, "Einzug", 305.

³⁴⁴ Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977) 134.

³⁴⁵ Cf. Stanton's fitting remarks: "Matthew's use of this title remains something of an enigma", "Origin" 1923.

³⁴⁶ A. Vögle, *Messias und Gottessohn: Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1971) 18, identifies three christological strands here.

³⁴⁷ It is noteworthy that some, such as Marshall D. Johnson, *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus* (Cambridge: University Press, 1969) *SNTSMS* 8, 225, and Rudolf Pesch, "Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1-2). Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate" *Bib* 48 (1967), 395-420, 416,

appear to have a titular importance within the gospel as a whole.³⁴⁸ One might therefore argue that the same might just as well be true for the Son of David. Yet this is wrong on both counts. Though the son of Abraham has no titular importance it has, nonetheless, considerable conceptual force throughout the gospel. It demonstrates right from the outset of the gospel that Jesus represents salvation for all peoples.³⁴⁹ The primacy of this notion in the first gospel was demonstrated above, a fact that makes its position at 1:1 readily explicable. By the same token, Son of David represents salvation for the Jews.³⁵⁰ Unlike son of Abraham, however, the title Son of David assumes an importance and "programmatic"³⁵¹ use over the course of the gospel.

This is certainly evident in the genealogy.³⁵² The title is emphasized at least implicitly, by the fact that David alone is expressly designated as τὸν βασιλέα (1:6),³⁵³ a title also not without significance in Matthew.³⁵⁴ The force of it, as Schulz neatly puts it, "erweist Jesu als den endzeitlichen Erneuer des davidischen Königtums, d.h. als der Messias, im dem die Geschichte Israels ihren Höhepunkt und Abschluß gefunden hat."³⁵⁵

The above factors lead Johnson to conclude that "of all four Gospels, it is Matthew who most clearly interprets the significance of Jesus along the lines of the

feel this is a reworking of Mark 1:1.

³⁴⁸ Johnson, *Purpose*, 219.

³⁴⁹ Vögtle, *Messias*, 18; Edward Schweizer, *Gemeinde* 17.

³⁵⁰ Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 62 "auf Israel zielenden Erscheinung"; Strecker, *Weg*, 119; Vögtle, *Messias*, 18; Bornkamm, "Risen", *TIM* 323-26, though he would understand the reference to Abraham in light of the new ἔθνος of God.

³⁵¹ The word is Frankemölle's, *Jahwebund*, 167.

³⁵² On the genealogy see Burger, *Davidssohn*, 91ff.; and on its integrity with the gospel as a whole, Johnson, *Purpose*, 218; Allen, *St. Matthew*, 2.

³⁵³ Cf. K. Stendahl, "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Matthew 1-2" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 56-66, 60, who remarks that "in 1:6 the royal status of David, and only of David, is stressed". The name of David assumes additional importance if the gematria on David (דוד 4 + 6 + 4 = 14) is assumed to underlie the scheme of 3 x 14 generations mentioned at 1:17. On this see Davies, *SSM*, 74-77; Schweizer, *Gemeinde*, 17 #36 and Stendahl "Quis" 60.

³⁵⁴ R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1965, 191) observes that "the title ὁ χριστός ("the Christ") and ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ("the King of the Jews") seem to be here [sc. 2:1-12] (uniquely) used as equivalent for the Davidic sonship . . .". It is also likely that the title at 27:11 reflects the Son of David, and certainly true of 21:5.

³⁵⁵ Siegfried Schulz, *Die Stunde der Botschaft: Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten* (Hamburg: Furche Verlag, 1970) 198.

Pharisaic conception of the Davidic Messiah."³⁵⁶ This conception arose out of the Old Testament promises to David (esp. 2 Sam 7:12-14; Is 9:6-7; Jer 23:5)³⁵⁷ and underwent various changes in later Judaism, emerging, among other places, in the seventeenth Psalm of Solomon (17:21-27).³⁵⁸

ἴδε, κύριε, καὶ ἀνάστησον αὐτοῖς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν υἱὸν
Δαυὶδ
εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ὃν οἶδας σύ, ὁ θεός
τοῦ βασιλεῦσαι ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ παῖδά σου.
καὶ ὑπόζωσον αὐτὸν ἰσχὺν τοῦ θραῦσαι ἄρχοντας ἀδίκους,
καθάρισον Ἱερουσαλημ ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν καταπατούντων ἐν
ἀπωλείᾳ
ἐν σοφίᾳ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ,
ἐξώσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἀπὸ κληρονομίας,
ἐκτρίψαι ὑπερηφανίαν ἁμαρτωλῶν ὡς σκευὴ κεραμέως,
ἐὼ ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ συντρίψαι πᾶσαν ὑπόστασιν αὐτῶν,
ὀλοθρεῦσαι ἔθνη παράνομα ἐν λόγῳ στόματος αὐτοῦ,
ἐν ἀπειλῇ αὐτοῦ φυγεῖν ἔθνη ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ,
καὶ ἐλέγξει ἁμαρτωλοὺς ἐν λόγῳ καρδίας αὐτῶν³⁵⁹

³⁵⁶ Johnson, *Purpose*, 218.

³⁵⁷ On the Old Testament background in particular see J. Fitzmyer, "The Son of David Tradition and Matt. 22.41-46 and Parallels", *Con* 10 (1966) 40-46, 41-43; and Dennis C. Duling, "The Promises to David and Their Entrance into Christianity—Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis" *NTS* 20 (1973).

³⁵⁸ Frankemölle describes Ψ Sol 17:21 (τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν υἱὸν Δαυὶδ) as "dem ältesten ausdrücklichen Beleg des Messias als Sohn Davids" *Jahwebund* 168 #51. Fitzmyer regards the psalm as "probably" Pharisaic, "Son", 43, while Eduard Lohse, "Der König aus Davids Geschlecht. Bemerkungen zur Messianischen Erwartung der Synagoge" in hrsg. O. Betz et al, *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel* AGSU 5 (Leiden: Brill, 1963, 337-345, 339) refers to "pharisäischen Kreisen" in this respect. On the other hand, see Charlesworth's attempt to discount this position in his review of J. Schüpphaus' *Die Psalmen Salomos: Eine Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* (ALGHJ 7, Leiden: Brill, 1977) in *JAAR* 50 (1982) 292-3. Schüpphaus also regards them as Pharisaic. On the Davidic Messiah in Qumran see Fitzmyer, "Son", 43-44.

³⁵⁹ The greek text is from Joseph L. Trafton, *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 11 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985). Lohse summarizes the essence of this conception in the Psalm as follows:

"Wie Gott einst David ausgerüstet und gestärkt hat, so wird er auch den endzeitlichen Befreier mit Kraft gürtet, damit er Jerusalem von den Heiden reinige, die Sünder mit eisernem Stabe zerschmettere und die Heiden mit dem Worte seines Mundes vernichte. Er wird ein gerechter König sein, der sich allein an Gottes Gebot hält und nach seinem Willen das Regiment führt." Lohse,

If this is the conception to which Johnson refers, then clear or not, it is evident that Matthew's genealogy embodies very few of these characteristics. One might single out the (implicit) qualities of Davidic descent and kingship, but that is about all. On the other hand, the deprecatory references to the gentiles do not accord very well with Jesus' designation as son of Abraham. Further difficulties will be treated below.

At this point it is also necessary to consider the adequacy of the title Son of David. A number of scholars have impugned it, since the disciples do not use it of Jesus, nor is it one of Jesus' self-appellations. It is confined to Jesus' earthly ministry, and even then to limited groups.³⁶⁰ Gerhardsson goes so far as to say that it is used by "simple ignorant outsiders".³⁶¹ Both Brown and Kingsbury further contend that its inadequacy is made explicit in the question about the Son of David (22:41-6).

The Son of David question will be treated below. As to the other points, it has to be said that while the above facts are true in themselves the inferences these scholars draw from them are questionable. If, for example, the title is used by "simple, ignorant outsiders" it is also used by Matthew himself at 1:1. This is decisive, for, quite apart from Matthew's increased use of the term, Matthew is the only one of the evangelists to expressly designate Jesus as Son of David.³⁶² Moreover, as the above discussion has shown, Matthew has expressly given Son of David a certain primacy by situating it at 1:1.³⁶³ Further, at 1:20 υἱός Δαυὶδ occurs in the mouth of the angel of the Lord (ἄγγελος κυρίου) which would again stress its appropriateness as a title for Jesus.³⁶⁴ Taken together these features put a different complexion on the above arguments.

"König", 339. He adds that the son of David will purify Jerusalem so that people will come from the ends of the earth to see its glory 339-340. See, in addition, Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, tr. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1913, 1970) 31-32.

³⁶⁰ See Kingsbury, "Title", 593-593 who also notes that the title does not occur in the death or resurrection narratives; cf. Brown, *Infancy*, 134-136.

³⁶¹ Birger Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 88.

³⁶² This is well brought out by David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*, SBLMS #18 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1973) 116.

³⁶³ Kingsbury's argument (following Pesch "Gottessohn", 411, 416) that "Matthew makes no reference to the term Son of God in 1:1 because . . . he desires that God himself should be the first one to pronounce this title openly, in the climatic baptismal scene" ("Title", 594) is weak. The effect would surely be more profound if God's testimony in the narrative itself were seen to agree with that of the narrator at 1:1.

³⁶⁴ Cf. Johnson, *Purpose*, 218, though the title is here used of Joseph.

With respect to the Son of David question, there have been several views which have stressed its insufficiency. Gibbs, for one, claims that the force of Jesus' argument in the dispute discredits "the Pharisees' notion of Messiahship *as determined* by sonship to David 'according to the flesh', rather than by the divine sonship, or unique spiritual relation to God—which was to Jesus the basis of his own messianic vocation".³⁶⁵ He goes on to argue that the position of the pericope relative to all of the other Son of David pericopae provides a further indication of the title's inadequacy.³⁶⁶

Kingsbury's argument is somewhat different. He asserts that Matthew has formulated the opening and closing questions so that they correspond and focus on the issue of sonship. Matthew's real argument, he suggests, is that "if David, in calling the Messiah 'Lord', has himself acknowledged in scripture [Psalm 110] that the Messiah is of higher station than he (viz, one exalted by God to the right hand of power), then the Messiah cannot be regarded as the 'Pharisees' view him, viz., as simply the Son of David ... but ... the Son of God; for in terms of sonship, it is the latter that surpasses the former".³⁶⁷

Neither of these arguments is especially compelling. Gibbs, for instance, fails to take cognizance of the seemingly "unscheinbar" but ultimately very major changes Matthew has wrought in his account.³⁶⁸ In Mark, the Son of David christology is attacked, but in Matthew the reverse is the case. Matthew is not intent on discrediting sonship "according to the flesh" but rather, in substantiating it. This is the whole point of 1:20—to legitimize the Son of David according to the flesh through adoption: "Jesus becomes 'Son of David' (1:1)... because he is adopted by Joseph 'Son of David' (1:20)".³⁶⁹ Gibbs has failed to recognize this.

³⁶⁵ Gibbs, "Purpose", 460-461 who is citing J. Vernon Bartlett, "S. Mark" in *Century Bible* (via C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 1, 289) italics his.

³⁶⁶ Gibbs, "Purpose", 461.

³⁶⁷ Kingsbury, "Title", 596.

³⁶⁸ The word is from Burger, *Davidsohn*, 88. On these changes see the penetrating analysis he offers pp. 88-89, and for a more basic overview, cf. Suhl, "Davidsohn", 60-61.

³⁶⁹ See W. Barnes Tatum, "The Origin of Jesus Messiah (Matt. 1:1, 18a): Matthew's Use of the Infancy Traditions", *JBL* 96 (1977) 523-535, 531. Part of the inherent difficulty with Gibbs' argument is that he is basing it on a framework derived from Mark's version of the pericope. His argument is derived from Bartlett's comments on Mark's version of the account.

His argument about the placement of the pericope in the gospel is also less than convincing. Is it likely that Matthew would be inclined (after 22 chapters) to suddenly reverse a position he himself had sanctioned at 1:1? Strecker's conclusions seem more plausible: "Da der Evangelist 'Davidssohn' durchaus als positive christologische Bezeichnung verwendet, ist von vornherein ausgeschlossen, daß er ... den Titel abgelehnt wissen wollte."³⁷⁰

Kingsbury's argument is more subtle, but represents a one-sided evaluation of the evidence. His major shortcoming is a failure to develop his contention that the terms are not relational. He simply acts on this assumption without substantiating it. With respect to his discussion of the text, he correctly notes that the questions concerning sonship are more pointed in Matthew's version of the pericope, but does not recognize that κύριος also receives a more pointed treatment.³⁷¹ Since Matthew accords prominence to this title both here and elsewhere,³⁷² might it not be preferable to understand the two titles to which he has explicitly given emphasis relationally, without having recourse to a third (unmentioned) title—namely Son of God? Daube, for instance, has noted the passage's similarity in form to the rabbinic category of

³⁷⁰ Strecker, *Weg*, 119, cf. Sand, *Gesetz*, 148.

³⁷¹ See, instead, Burger, *Davidssohn*, 89: "Im Unterschied zu Markus kommt Matthäus dem Psalmzitat zuvor und gebraucht κύριος bereits in V.43. Daraus erhellt, daß für ihn nicht nur das Problem, wie kann ein Sohn der Herr seines Vaters sein, sondern speziell die Kyrios-Bezeichnung den Kern der Auseinandersetzung bildet". To this can be added Matthew's change of Mark's πόθεν το πῶς and λέγω το καλέω. On these changes Duling, "Therapeutic", 406, remarks that "the variation in interrogative, the twofold form of the question, and the change from λέγω to καλέω appear to make the relationship between David's son and David's Lord a more balanced one".

³⁷² On κύριος, cf. among others H. D. Betz, "Jesus as Divine Man" in F. Thomas Trotter (ed.), *Jesus and the Historian* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968) 114-133, 125; Bornkamm, "End-Expectation", 41-43; Davies, *SSM*, 96-99; Strecker, *Weg*, 123-125. Kingsbury's own examination of the title ("The Title 'kyrios' in Matthew's Gospel" *JBL* 94 (1975) 246-255, attempts to discount these views, largely by showing how κύριος is subordinated to other christological terms in Matthew "... it basically refers beyond itself to some other, more definitive title, it is most properly to be regarded in the First Gospel not as one of the chief titles with which Matthew develops his christology (or indeed the primary one), but as an auxiliary christological title" (255). The difficulty with this (and indeed with many of Kingsbury's christological analyses) is that it discounts the relational nature of Matthew's christological terminology in favour of a rigidly hierarchical schema. As Hill astutely remarks of Kingsbury's approach in *Matthew: Structure, Christology and Kingdom* (London: SPCK, 1976) "no rationale is provided for the view that one christological title needs to be understood as "most exalted", "foremost", "principal" or "preeminent" (pp. 67, 99, 162), yet this seems to serve as a methodological presupposition of the investigation" ("Son" 4). The same holds true for this paper here ("Kyrios", "pre-eminence" 246 "ascendancy" 254).

See in addition the related criticisms by Stanton, "Origin", 1924 and Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel*, OBO 23, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979) 183, as well as the more general remarks on christology by Donaldson in *Mountain*, 204.

haggadah (current in the first century) which treated various apparent contradictions in scripture by making a distinction.³⁷³ Here, he suggests that "the answer implied is not that one notion is right and the other wrong, but that both are right in different contexts".³⁷⁴ This can be understood in various ways,³⁷⁵ but regardless of the specific way, it has the advantage, as against Kingsbury's proposal, of not detracting from the importance Matthew elsewhere gives the title, especially in Chapter 1.³⁷⁶ It is possible that Son of God might be alluded to here, but even in this instance it would best be taken as relational.³⁷⁷ What would again have to be questioned is the assertion that Son of God "outranks" Son of David.³⁷⁸ Until Kingsbury can demonstrate the opposite contention, namely that Matthew has expressly ordered an hierarchical christology, this resolution is to be preferred.³⁷⁹

The above discussion suggests therefore that Matthew regards Son of David as an adequate christological title. Kingsbury and others are correct, however, in suggesting that it had specific parameters. These shall be discussed next.

6c. *The Therapeutic Son of David*

The sphere where Matthew most often uses the title is a therapeutic one. In fact, apart from the verses discussed above, all the remaining references to Son of

³⁷³ David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: The Athlone Press, 1956) 158-159, 63.

³⁷⁴ Daube, *Rabbinic*, 163 speaking of both Mark and Matthew.

³⁷⁵ Daube suggests "he is David's son according to the flesh, but his Lord according to the spirit" *Rabbinic*, 163. He is followed by Jeremias *Verheissung*, 45. Bornkamm, "End-Expectation", 33, suggests "in his earthly lowliness he is David's son, but as the Exalted One he is Lord". (Cf. F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel: ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964) 260-262 who adopts a related solution for Mark on the basis of "Zweistufen christologie".) Strecker, *Weg*, 120 speaks of a theological "gleichzeitiges Nebeneinander" and is followed by Frankemölle (who prefers to speak of a "theologisch-literarisches Ineinander" *Jahwebund*, 169 #53). Stecker's view seems most promising in seeing the distinction as a "Nebeneinander". As shall be shown below, the distinction between the two titles might best be described in terms of a healing-servant Son of David sent to Israel on the one hand, and an authoritative lord sent to all peoples (though most characteristically to his church). Hay, *Glory*, 117, offers a different distinction whereby Son of David relates to Israel and Son of God to all peoples.

³⁷⁶ See Hahn's general observations, *Hoheitstitel*, 261.

³⁷⁷ One need only point to the concatenation of titles at 1:1 for a similar instance of a "relational" approach—Matthew gives no indication here of a "pre-eminent" title.

³⁷⁸ The word is Kingsbury's, "Title", 596.

³⁷⁹ It goes without saying, of course, that Matthew offers no indications of an hierarchical christological schema.

David occur within this context. In the mouths of the crowds (12:23; 21:9), children (21:15) or suppliants (9:27; 15:22; 20:30, 31), the term is connected with healing.³⁸⁰ The prevalence of this conception has been recognized by several scholars who argue for the primacy of the Son of David as a therapeutic figure.³⁸¹ What is less clear, is how the Son of David came to be associated with healing. Some have argued for a connexion between Solomon and exorcism,³⁸² but the argument is tenuous at best.³⁸³

A more readily demonstrable connexion can be seen between Jesus as Son of David and Jesus as servant.³⁸⁴ This is most evident in Chapter 12 where Matthew has inserted Isaiah 42:1-4 (12:18-21) between two healing accounts (12:9-14, cf. 15 and 12:22ff.). The second of these prompts the crowds to ask about the Son of David. Lindars states that "this Davidic title expresses Matthew's own interpretation of Is 42:1-4, which he has just quoted."³⁸⁵ Fuller also sees a correlation between servant and Son of David at 8:17 (Is 53:4).³⁸⁶ Certainly, Matthew's concern to emphasize healing in

³⁸⁰ This assumes that the crowd's use of the title at 21:9 is an indirect response to the healing of the blind men 20:29 ff., the crowd having taken over the blind men's use of the title. Apart from 20:29ff. (based on Mark's Bartimaeus account 10:46-52, cf. 47, 48) all the remaining *Stellen* are Matthean. Cf. Burger, *Davidssohn*, 90.

³⁸¹ Cf. Burger, *Davidssohn*, 90, 170, "Für ihn [Mt] ist Davids Sohn der Wunderheiland"; Duling, "Therapeutic", 407; Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 78-79.

³⁸² See Klaus Berger, "Die königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments" *NTS* 20 (1974) 1-44, 3-9; Dennis C. Duling, "Solomon, Exorcism and Son of David" *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-252; Loren R. Fisher, "Can This be the Son of David", in Trotter, *Historian*, 82-97.

³⁸³ As is recognized by Duling, "Therapeutic" 409-410. Not only are the connexions between Son of David and exorcism highly conjectural, but Jesus' healing in Matthew are largely non-exorcistic.

³⁸⁴ On the connection between Messiah and servant cf. Zech 3:8. The servant in Isaiah 53, is identified with the messiah in the Isaiah Targum (B. Chilton *Isaiah Targum*). Chilton (*Glory*, 86-96, 92) believes that this identification is early enough to reflect a primitive messianology "unperturbed by Christian claims". Nevertheless, in spite of his intercessory activity (see Koch, "Messias", 117-48, 147-48.), the picture of the servant in the targum is not at all of a suffering messiah, but of an exalted servant. See further, Donald Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 119-33.

³⁸⁵ Lindars, *Apologetic*, 262.

³⁸⁶ Fuller, *Foundations*, 189. See too Hill, "Son", 9 - "Jesus heals as 'Servant' (as well as, perhaps, 'Son of David' and as Shepherd of Israel)". On further associations between Son of David and servant see Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 87; Nolan, *Royal*, 178 and also Jerome H. Neyrey, "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42, 1-4 in Matthew 12" *Bib* 63 (1982) 457-473, 467-468 though he adopts a different (and questionable) view concerning the character of the *Reflexionszitate*.

Both the above *Reflexionszitate* should be understood as Matthew's redactional work—so Hill's "Son", 9 *pace*, Strecker, *Weg*, 66-67. Against Strecker's view of a pre-Matthean source of written testimonia see Stendahl, *School*, vi-ix and Kümmel, *Introduction*, 112.

these *Reflexionszitate*³⁸⁷ closely aligns Jesus as servant with Jesus as Son of David.

If this correlation holds, however, it immediately raises questions about the so-called "Pharisaic" conception of the Son of David discussed earlier. When the two are compared they emerge as antinomies. The therapeutic Son of David does not come to smash with an iron rod (ψSal 17:26), rather "he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smouldering wick" (12:20).³⁸⁸ He does not destroy the gentiles with the word of his mouth—instead he heals them (15:21-28), proclaims justice to them and gives them cause to hope (12:18, 21). Instead of destroying sinners he desires "mercy instead of sacrifice" (9:13; 12:7).³⁸⁹ Matthew has established Jesus as a scion of David, and a king, but it is a humble not a conquering king he describes (21:5). In doing this he turns the so-called "Pharisaic" conception on its head, and presents a portrait of the Son of David very different from popular expectation.³⁹⁰

Matthew's conception might even be seen as a deliberate reaction to the kind of expectation typified by the the seventeenth psalm of Solomon. If (*pace* Charlesworth) these psalms can, in fact, justly be regarded as Pharisaic, this might provide an additional reason for Matthew's antipathy to the Pharisees. Once again, they would have made void the word of God for the sake of their traditions (cf. 15:6), in this case, by ignoring what was prophesied about Jesus in favour of their own expectations about the Son of David. They would have flagrantly misunderstood the true nature of the

³⁸⁷ Barth, (*TIM* 128) observes with respect to 12:20a that both acts of healing and preaching are intended. See too Held, *TIM* 261. Healing is even more prominent in 8:17 where Matthew has avoided the spiritualizing LXX version of the passage οὗτος τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾷται in favour of Αὐτὸς τὰς ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβεν καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν. As Held, *TIM*, 260, remarks "There can be no doubt that he speaks of real physical sicknesses". See too Geist's (*Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium* FB (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986) 376-377) discussion.

³⁸⁸ The contrasting use of συντριβῶ at ψ Sal 17:26 and Mt 12:20 is particularly arresting.

³⁸⁹ Nolan, *Royal*, 183 #5, notes that the cry ἐλέησον is found four times with Son of David (in therapeutic contexts) and only once elsewhere in the gospel. See Held, *TIM*, 220 as well.

³⁹⁰ Leonhard Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament: Volume 2; The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ*, tr. J. E. Alsup, ed. J. Roloff (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 220) remarks that what Matthew says "about the Son of David was not what Judaism was expecting in regard to *ben-dawid*." See too G. Bornkamm, "Matthäus als Interpret der Herrenworte" *TLZ* 79 (1954) cols. 341-46, 344 #5; Burger, *Davidsohn*, 44; Gundry, *Matthew*, 231. Matthew's rationale here is probably apologetic, at least in part. Why did the Jews not recognize Jesus? —it was because he was not the figure they were looking for and they missed him. Cf. Goppelt, *Theology*, 221-222, who comes to a similar stance, and also fittingly stresses the "salvation-historical statement" beyond the apologetic (221). Lohse ("υἱός", 490) also suggests something of an apologetic.

Messiah, just as they have misunderstood at 22:41-46. It is hardly without significance that Matthew alone has made the Pharisees Jesus' interlocutors for this particular pericope.³⁹¹ Nor is it without significance that it is a christological controversy that ultimately confounds the Pharisees, and leads to their asking Jesus no more questions. Once again, this is a feature which is only found in Matthew,³⁹² and indicates that Jesus and his church have the final word about the Messiah.

This prompts a further question. Given the disparity between the above two messianic conceptions, do the various individuals or groups in Matthew who use the title of Jesus in a therapeutic sense invariably understand it as being messianic? The answer would appear to be that it depends on the group or individuals. It is true, as Burger rightly notes that "nach der matthäischen Formulierung scheint es eine jüdische Selbstverständlichkeit zu sein: Der Davidssohn tut Wunder",³⁹³ but this hardly meshes with what appears to have been popular expectation. For this reason, the two groups using the term will be examined separately³⁹⁴—first the suppliants and then the crowds.

In the case of the suppliants the title does appear to be messianic since Matthew invariably has then advert to another christological title—namely κύριος. Each suppliant when first encountering Jesus addresses him as Son of David (or Lord, Son of David), entreats him to have mercy, and then moves ultimately to Lord (9:27 [υἱὸς Δαυὶδ] 9:28 [κύριε]; 15:22 [κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ] 25, 27 [κύριε], 20:30 [κύριε] υἱὸς Δαυὶδ 31 κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυὶδ 33 κύριε)].³⁹⁵ In each of these episodes it is only when Jesus has been addressed exclusively as Lord that the supplicants are healed.³⁹⁶ If, as

³⁹¹ Mark and Luke both speak of the scribes: Mk 13:35; Lk 21:39. Moreover, it is only in Matthew that Jesus has interlocutors. In Mark and Luke it is phrased as a rhetorical question. That the Pharisees are made to reply "Son of David" is itself suggestive.

³⁹² Both Mk (12:34b) and Lk (20:40) situate it earlier.

³⁹³ Burger, *Davidssohn*, 79.

³⁹⁴ On the basis of the foregoing discussion it will be assumed that the childrens' use of the title represents an adequate messianic understanding on their part (21:15). Because the healing accounts show considerable affinities with each other, the individual narratives of suppliants who call on the Son of David will be treated as a group.

³⁹⁵ There is also textual support for the vocative υἱέ in every instance where the nominative occurs. For the variants' primacy cf. Kingsbury, "Kyrios", 252 #31, and against his position Metzger, *Textual*, 53-54 who argues that the vocative represents a more polished style than the nominative, citing BDF 147 (3).

³⁹⁶ Suhl, "Davidssohn" 73-75, notes something similar, and also points out that it is only on the petitioners' second request that Jesus responds with healing. It is worth noting that this pattern has been carefully developed by Matthew. For instance, Son of David does not occur in Mark's account of

seems likely, this vocative use of κύριος is more than honorific³⁹⁷ it would indicate a broader messianic understanding on their part. This view is also supported by the fact that two of the three supplicants are commended for their faith (9:29 [cf. Mk 10:52]); 15:28 [no Mkn //]. At 20:30 the motif is replaced by a reference to Jesus' compassion). This is no insignificant detail in a gospel where the disciples are criticized for ὀλιγοπιστίς. It is, moreover, a feature which ties in with their repeated requests, and their final appeal to Jesus as Lord. For these reasons it is best to conclude that the supplicants have a messianic understanding. Not only have they recognized Jesus *qua* messianic healer, but what is more have recognized the authority which lies behind this—Jesus as authoritative Lord.³⁹⁸ It is their appeal to this authority that results in their healing.³⁹⁹

the Syrophoenician Woman and κύριε only once (7:28 κύριε) versus 4 times in Matthew's version (3 times in the vocative 15:22, 25, 27 as well as the significant change of Mark's τῶν ψυχίων τῶν παιδίων to τῶν ψυχίων τῶν πικτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν). κύριε does not figure in the Bartimaeus narrative but occurs once in the first healing of the blind men (9:28) and twice (or three times) in the second healing (20:30 v.l.; 31, 33). Held (*TIM* 235) has remarked on a further difference—in Mark κύριε is never used in a request.

³⁹⁷ Bornkamm, *TIM* 42 describes it as "the form of address to Jesus as the miracle-working Saviour" while Schulz, *Stunde*, 199 states "Der irdische Jesus ist nach Matthäus der göttliche Herr. Der Herr-Anrede gilt deshalb vor allem dem Wundertäter (8,2; 9,28; 15,27; 20, 30; u.ö), aber auch die Anbetung und der aus dem Gottesdienst stammende Ruf "Erbarne dich mein" (9,27; 15,22; u.ö) bzw. "Errette uns" (8,25; 14,20; u.ö) unterstreichen diesen christologischen Sachverhalt. Konsequenz scheidet Matthäus deshalb die 'Herr-Anrede' der Jünger von derjenigen der Gegner Jesu, die sich mit dem Lehrer-Titel begnügen müssen". See too J. Dupont, "L'évangile de saint Matthieu: quelques clés de lecture" *Communautés et Liturgie* 1, (1975) 3-40, 13. Fitzmyer, "κύριος" *EWNT* II, cols. 811-820) is more cautious—"mag", while C.F.D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977) 35 and #48 issues a caveat against understanding the vocative as a christological title. He does allow (citing Mt 7:21) that "the context sometimes enhances the meaning of the vocative" (#48). Might not this allowance be urged in the above instances, not least because of the affinities Schulz has noted between the use of the term by the disciples (8:25; 14:30) and that of the suppliants? Further, if κύριος was merely honorific its use alone after Son of David would represent a dénouement. Yet the context in the stories suggests an intensification. Kingsbury has missed the force of this. He (albeit tentatively) suggests that "kyrie" is meant to refer beyond itself to Son of David as the primary title" ("Kyrios", 253). Yet if this were so, one would expect Son of David in the ultimate position—instead, the intensification is expressly associated with κύριος.

³⁹⁸ Held (*TIM* 262) notes that "on the one hand, the healing stories Matthew works out the concept of the Lord (*Kyrios*) and understands them entirely as manifestations of his might; but on the others with Matt. 8:17 he interprets them as the work of the servant of God of Isaiah 53".

³⁹⁹ Because their use of κύριος approximates that of the disciples (and not least because one is a gentile) these healings point to the later situation of the church. Their use of the historicizing Son of David here situates them within Jesus' historical ministry to Israel, but the use of κύριος, points to a time beyond this and to a situation and milieu where Jesus' authority is implicitly recognized. Strecker, *Weg*, 124 detects in these references to the Lord a possible eschatological character, but the affinities with the disciples' general use of the title suggests otherwise. As Goppelt, *Theology*, 221 germanely remarks, Matthew "wanted . . . to bring his community to the place where it would associate with the worship-service invocation of the exalted One as Lord an image that was concretely shaped in terms of the earthly One." The Son of David question ought to be considered in this light as well. Matthew, as was shown above, recognizes Son of David as a valid title, but one more particularly fitted to Israel as a whole than to his community. Matthew's framing of the discussion,

Before considering the nature of the crowd's exclamation at 21:9 it is necessary to consider the character of the Triumphal Entry as a whole.⁴⁰⁰ This ought to provide the appropriate context for evaluating their statements.

In Matthew's version of the entry there are two predominant elements. The first is Jesus' *πράτης*. This arises chiefly out of Matthew's mixed *Reflexionszitat* (Is 62:11; Zech 9:9) which characterizes Jesus as a humble king.⁴⁰¹ Matthew is the only synoptic evangelist to explicitly cite Zech 9:9, and he has altered the passage so as to emphasize Jesus' humility.⁴⁰² Of a piece with this is his omission of the βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυίδ (Mk 11:10) which eliminates any possible misunderstandings about the nature of his kingship.⁴⁰³ He comes not as a political king on a warhorse, but as a humble king mounted on an ass and the foal of an ass.⁴⁰⁴

The other feature that predominates in the Triumphal Entry account, or more accurately, around it, is healings by the Son of David. As in Mark, a healing precedes Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. The account differs from Mark in having Jesus proceed to the temple immediately after the Triumphal Entry, and not the next day (cf. Mk 11:12,15). Jesus cleanses the temple, and then, in a Matthean addition⁴⁰⁵ has Jesus

therefore, might in part be said to advocate the use of κύριος—particularly in epiclesis—within his community.

⁴⁰⁰ The discussion above did not consider what Son of David meant, and that question will be taken up here.

On the Triumphal Entry see: Roman Bartnicki, "Il Carattere Messianico delle Pericopi di Marco e Matteo sull'Ingresso di Gesù in Gerusalemme (Mc 11,1-10; Mt 21, 1-2) *RivB* 25 (1977) 5-27; J. Blenkinsopp, "The Hidden Messiah and His Entry into Jerusalem" *Scr* 13 (1961) 51-56, 81-88 and *idem*, "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry" *JBL* 80 (1961) 55-64; Burger, *Davidssohn*, 81-87; Albert William Martin Jr., *The Interpretation of the Triumphal Entry in the Early Church*. Vanderbilt Ph.D., '71 (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms); Hermann Patsch, "Der Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem *ZTK* 68 (1971) 1-26; Trilling, "Einzug" 303-309; Pp. Zarella, "L'entrata di Gesù in Gerusalemme nella Redazione di Matteo" in *La Distruzione di Gerusalemme del 70* (Assisi: Studio Teologico "Porziuncola", 1971) *Collectio Assisiensis* 8, 111-133.

⁴⁰¹ See Patsch, "Einzug", 10-11; Trilling, "Einzug", 304-305; Franz Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet* OBO 2 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1973), 103.

⁴⁰² He has omitted δίκαιος καὶ σφύζων αὐτός to give prominence to *πράτης*. For a detailed discussion see Barth, "Law", 129-130.

⁴⁰³ Trilling, "Einzug", 303 #2.

⁴⁰⁴ There is no need to go into the question of whether this represents a misunderstanding on Matthew's part. For thorough discussions see Stendahl, *School*; R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* NovTSup 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967); W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangelium* WMANT V, 8 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969) *ad loc.*

⁴⁰⁵ "Der ganze Abschnitt scheint... eine Komposition des Evangelisten zu sein", Burger, *Davidssohn*, 87.

heal the blind and the lame, whereupon the children acclaim him as the Son of David. The children's cry is identical to that of the crowd at 21:9 (Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ), and the crowd's use of the title reflects the use of the title by the blind men at 20:30ff.. The effect is twofold. On the one hand, it links the title expressly with Jesus' healing function and thereby brackets the Triumphal Entry between healings, thus establishing a context in which to understand it. On the other hand, it helps represent the Triumphal Entry as the culminating point in Jesus' healing ministry. In Matthew, the Entry really ends with Jesus healing in the temple itself,⁴⁰⁶ and this gives a very definite complexion to the passage as a whole.

Finally, it must be added that in Matthew the Triumphal Entry represents a popular reaction. Unlike Luke, for instance, where it is the disciples who acclaim Jesus (Lk 19:37 τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν), here it is the crowds not the disciples. Moreover, the effect of the procession is so considerable that the whole city is shaken, and prompts the inhabitants to ask who he is (21:10 cf. 2:3 where Herod and all Jerusalem are shaken (ἐταράχθη) at the news of the birth of the βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων). In sum, it was not an event which took place in a corner.⁴⁰⁷

Together these features suggest that Matthew has placed a "messianic" interpretation on to the events of the Triumphal Entry. Just as clearly though, his messianic conception must be regarded as that of the servant messiah—the humble healer who has come expressly to minister to his people.

6d. *The Crowds and the Son of David*

Given its messianic context, how is one to understand the crowds' utterances at 21:9? There is no doubt that they contribute to Matthew's overall messianic portrayal, but are they themselves incontrovertibly messianic? Strangely, they do not create this

⁴⁰⁶ In Mark, Jesus does not heal in Jerusalem. On the pericope see Manson, *Sayings*, 221, Trilling, "Einzug", 303, "Der Tempel ist . . . das Ziel des Einzugs, geworden".

⁴⁰⁷ Trilling, "Einzug", 303. Cf. too, George M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew*, AnBib 63 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976) 155 "Matthew is at pains to emphasize its popular and public character", 157; ". . . everything that can heighten the impression of the public and popular character of the acclamation is carefully explicated and emphasized".

impression. The cry "Hosanna" is problematic in this respect, and depends on the extent to which its apparent liturgical use is reflected in the crowds' statement, and on the character of that liturgical use.⁴⁰⁸ This is by no means easily determined. It may reflect liturgical usage, or may at this point have become a generalized expression that here, as Goodspeed says is "no more liturgical than 'God save the King'".⁴⁰⁹ Either way, Fitzmyer is probably correct in arguing that there is no evidence for its association "with a messianic expectation in pre-Christian Judaism".⁴¹⁰

The reference to ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is perhaps a bit more readily established. Some have seen possible messianic allusions here,⁴¹¹ especially if 11:3 (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) is seen to refer to the Messiah.⁴¹² At 11:3, however, the word is used absolutely—here it is qualified by ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, and therefore cannot be taken as a title.⁴¹³ Arens, in his discussion of the phrase, holds that "to come ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is equivalent to 'sent by God' and implies an 'ambassadorial mission' like that of the prophets, as in 1 Sam. 17,45, wherein David tells Goliath 'I have come against you in the name of the Lord of Hosts . . .'.⁴¹⁴ Arens goes on to

⁴⁰⁸ On Hosanna see: J. Hempel, "Hosanna", *IDB* II 648; J. Spencer Kennard, Sr. "Hosanna and the Purpose of Jesus" *JBL* 67 (1948) 171-176; J. A. Motyer, "ὡσαννά" s.v. "Amen" *NIDNTT* I, 100. Werner's proposed solution, (Eric Werner, "Hosanna" in the Gospels" *JBL* 65 (1946) 97-122) to the problematic occurrence of the word with the dative is ingenious, but ultimately not convincing. Lohse suggests (Eduard Lohse, "Hosanna" 6 (1963) 113-119, see too E. Lohse "ὡσαννά" *TDNT* 9, 682-683) that Hosanna had become a stock formula prior to its use in the Christian community (*pace* Strecker *Weg* 21 #3). J. Fitzmyer in a recent article ("Aramaic Evidence affecting the Interpretation of Hosanna in the New Testament" in G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 110-118) makes an effective case for regarding Hosanna "as a cry of greeting or homage" (115). Fitzmyer further argues that "the term undoubtedly represents a cry that Jerusalemites used to greet pilgrims coming to Jerusalem for feasts like that of Tabernacles and perhaps even Passover" (115).

⁴⁰⁹ E. J. Goodspeed, *Problems of New Testament Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945) 35 cited in Martin, *Interpretation*, 143 #3 continued 144. Motyer ("ὡσαννά" 100) implies (cf. Mt, Mk and Jn) that it was used liturgically, but used unwittingly of Jesus.

⁴¹⁰ Fitzmyer, "Hosanna", 115. He rightly discounts Warner's argument, and rejects Lohse's evidence as being too late.

⁴¹¹ Cf. Sand, *Gesetz*, 147 implies this in light of later Jewish usage *S-B* I 850. See too Fenton, *St. Matthew*, 331.

⁴¹² Jacques Dupont, "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste" (Mt 11, 2-6, Lk 7, 18-23) *NRT* 83 (1961) 805-821, 943-959, 821, sees 11:3 as referring to "le Juge redoutable qui condamne les impies" while Eduardo Arens, (*The HΛΘON - sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-critical Investigation* OBO 10 (Freiburg: Universitäts Verlag, 1976) 290) considers it "a circumloquium for 'the Messiah'". Cullman, (*Christology*, 26 cf. 36) suggests it might refer to the Messiah, or alternatively, to the "Prophet of the End".

⁴¹³ So Arens, *Sayings*, 291.

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 292-293.

interpret this messianically in light of Zech 9:9,⁴¹⁵ which is to say, he does not regard the utterance as messianic until it is fit into the larger interpretive framework Matthew provides.⁴¹⁶ Thus, the phrase ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is not, in itself, messianic either.

If the above elements need not be regarded as messianic, what about the title Son of David itself? The children's cry at 21:15 received Jesus' approbation and was regarded as "perfect praise". How then can the crowds' cry be regarded as less? The answer would appear to reside in the fact that Matthew indicates that their understanding of the person of Jesus is less than that of the children. He appears to qualify the crowds' utterance in two ways.

The first is most clearly developed in the pericope of the healing of the two blind men (20:29-34). Matthew has made several decisive changes to the account. Mark depicts a large crowd (ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ 10:46) in which πολλοί rebuke Bartimaeus (10:48). Matthew also has a large crowd (ὄχλος πολὺς 20:29), but significantly has the entire crowd (ὁ δὲ ὄχλος 10:31) rebuke the blind men. Instead of differentiating among the crowd as he does, for instance, in the Triumphal Entry account,⁴¹⁷ he devolves the entire responsibility onto the crowd as a whole. This is rather strange, for it attributes a fundamental misunderstanding about Jesus *qua* therapeutic Son of David to the very crowd of the Triumphal Entry.

There are other features in the account which indicate that this represents a deliberate change on Matthew's part. He has eliminated the faith motif found in the other member of this doublet (9:29 cf. Mk 10:52) and replaced it with a reference to Jesus' compassion.⁴¹⁸ This is the only time Matthew uses the word with reference to

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 293.

⁴¹⁶ Also significant in this context is Matthew's removal of any explicit reference to king or kingship from the crowd's remarks cf. Mk 11:10; Lk 19:38 (μαθητῶν); Jn 12:13.

⁴¹⁷ 21:8 ἄλλοι 21:9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες. Cf. Luke's healing account where it is οἱ προάγοντες (18:39) who rebuke the beggar.

⁴¹⁸ Duling describes the omission of the reference to faith as "so strikingly un-matthean" ("Therapeutic", 403). See too Held, *TIM*, 221 #1. In general, references to Jesus' emotions are downplayed in Matthew (cf. Sanders, *Tendencies*, 186, Loader, "Son of David", 579, Kümmel, *Introduction*, 108) though cf. 9:30's difficult ἐνεβριμήθη. Loader, "Son of David", 579 #30 translates it as "deeply moved" citing Jn 11:33, 38. Given the parallel to 20:34, his view is probably to be preferred.

individuals—the other occurrences apply to Jesus' compassion for the crowds as a whole.⁴¹⁹ The effect of including it here is to produce a marked contrast between the crowd's callousness and Jesus' compassion. This callousness is unrelieved through the entire account. In Mark, the crowd relents and says to Bartimaeus "Take heart, rise, he is calling you" (10:49). Matthew excludes the crowd altogether and has Jesus deal with the blind man directly.⁴²⁰ Further, Matthew's retention of Mark's twice-iterated "Son of David" (20:30, rebuke 31a, 31b cf. Mk 10:47, 48 rebuke, 48b) heightens the contrast between Jesus and the crowd. So does Jesus' healing of the supplicants' blindness; Gibbs states that "it would appear that Matthew means to imply that the ὄχλοι, being spiritually blind, still rejects the witness of those who can really see that this is *the* Son of David".⁴²¹ As a whole then, the recasting of the pericope presents a far more negative portrayal of the crowd than Mark does. This is a noteworthy change. Surely if Matthew were intent on giving considerable weight to the praise of the crowd, he would be unlikely to modify this pericope so that it stressed the crowds' lack of understanding and their lack of compassion. But that is exactly what he has done. This can only call their acclaim at 21:9 into question.⁴²²

A tertiary consideration affecting this argument is the role of the above-mentioned "simple ignorant outsiders" within the gospel. It is noteworthy that the only ones Jesus ever commends for faith or praises for using the title Son of David are blind men (9:27ff.),⁴²³ a gentile (15:21) or children (21:16). All are "outsiders", and the very point of giving them insight is to contrast them with those "insiders" who lack it (cf. 11:25-27 Q). Certainly the leaders are foremost in this category but the fact that this dichotomy is found between the blind men and the crowds immediately prior to the

⁴¹⁹ 9:36; 14:14; 15:15 compare Mk 1:41 (individual); 9:22 (father and son) 6:34; 8:2 (crowds).

⁴²⁰ This doubtless also reflects Matthew's penchant for abbreviation—Held, *TIM* 224ff..

⁴²¹ Gibbs, "Purpose", 459. Cf. Patte, *Matthew* 286 "for the readers such crowds are not trustworthy".

⁴²² One could argue that this pericope represents the crowd at last coming to more of an awareness of who the therapeutic Son of David is, which effloresces in the Triumphal Entry. This is true in part, but it would indicate an enthusiastic, and very likely, shallow appraisal of who he is. That this is the case will be shown below.

⁴²³ Gibbs "Purpose" 462-463 is very good at bringing this out, especially in relation to the blindness of the Pharisees which is given such emphasis in Chapter 23.

Triumphal Entry would suggest that here they too are considered "insiders".⁴²⁴

Matthew, in addition, qualifies the crowds' response immediately following their outburst. This is when they designate Jesus as a prophet at 21:11. The grounds for this view will be developed in the next section; suffice it to say for the moment that it is to be understood as an inadequate messianic designation.⁴²⁵

What this suggests, therefore, is that immediately prior to the Triumphal Entry and immediately after it, Matthew presents the reader with reasons for questioning the depth of the crowds' understanding. Matthew certainly intends the crowds' remarks to fit into the overall messianic account that he has constructed, but at the same time he wants to show that the crowds do not regard it as messianic. They see Jesus as a healer sent by God, and a prophet. As such he calls forth their acclaim. They do not see in him the Messiah.⁴²⁶

The reason for this is two-fold. First, Matthew wants to depict a messianic entry into Jerusalem, but more than that, the entry of the therapeutic servant Messiah. This explains the emphasis on healings in this account. The crowds are naturally included in all this to stress the popular character of Jesus' ministry. Not only are the crowds witness to Jesus' healing of the two blind men (20:29ff.), but more importantly, they themselves are witnesses to Jesus' compassion and healing. They,

⁴²⁴ It might be added that all the suppliants (who comprise the core of the "outsiders") use the title κύριος of Jesus, while it is never used by the crowds.

⁴²⁵ To take two generalizing remarks: "Jesus is mehr als ein Prophet, auch mehr als *der* Prophet" (Dieter Lührmann, "Jesus und seine Propheten: Gesprächsbeitrag" in J. Panagopoulos (ed.), *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*, NovTSup 45 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977) 210-217, 214, and "der Sohn auch mehr ist als der höchste Prophet" (Karl Hermann Schelkle, "Jesus-Lehrer und Prophet" in P. Hoffman, N. Brox, W. Pesch (hrsg.) *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*, (Freiburg: Herder, 1973) 300-308, 306.

⁴²⁶ To substantiate this view, one might append another argument which concerns the apologetic character of Matthew. If the great majority of Judaism had in fact recognized Jesus as the Messiah at the Triumphal Entry (given its "popular" character in Matthew) and then subsequently (and deliberately) put him to death, there would be little point in apologetic or anti-Pharisaic polemic. They would have known exactly what they were doing. Yet Matthew's apologetic appears, almost invariably, to work on the assumption that the crowds did not know what they were doing, but were put up to it by the malign influence of the Jewish leaders.

Suhl, "Davidssohn", 70 also brings out the fact that the disciples do not join in the adulation with the crowds as an indication of the crowds' inadequate praise. This however is better explained by the public character of the title Son of David. Here, more than anywhere else in the gospel, it reflects Jesus' mission to his people (aptly symbolized by the healings in the Temple), and since the disciples are associated with him in that ministry they do not use that title, but κύριος (or Son of God) instead. Martin, *Interpretation*, 133 misses the force of all this when he states that the crowds' "reaction to Jesus' approach to Jerusalem shows the proper attitude of true disciples to their Lord".

therefore, are those most suited to acclaim Jesus as a healer, and their acclaim stresses that Jesus was recognized as a healer by many of the people.

On the other hand, Matthew is also showing why many of the people did not recognize him. Instead of coming as the political, triumphant, Messiah he came as the humble, servant, Messiah. And instead of coming with force as judge of the sinners he came as the compassionate healer to his people. And though they recognized him as a healer and thaumaturge they did not recognize in him the Messiah. The irony, and the tragedy is that they were so close.⁴²⁷

This "closeness" can be seen from a comparison with the crowds' response here and at 12:23. Clearly there is an advance in their awareness. The *μήτι* is no longer in force—they now, without question, regard him as the Son of David. As such then, their acclaim represents a measure of progress. Not only has their attention moved from the deed to the doer, but the doer himself is now (as never before) acclaimed. The Matthean "Hosanna to the Son of David" is decisive in this respect—Jesus is now the cynosure. Concomitant with this is the fact that their response has become more appropriate. In praising him as a healer they are not far away from praising him as the Messiah. As a result of Jesus' activity amongst them, they have come very close to recognizing him.

Conclusion

The above discussion prompts two sets of conclusions—the first concerning the Son of David, the second concerning the crowd's reaction to him.

In the first gospel, Son of David is an adequate christological title, and Matthew takes pains to show how Jesus is both the heir to it and the culmination of it. Because of this heritage (and its juxtaposition with Son of Abraham 1:1) the title is a public one and characterizes Jesus in his ministry to Israel. Matthew's depiction of the Son of

⁴²⁷ Compare Gibbs' remarks, "Purpose", 464—"The mass of the Jews were moving toward recognition of Jesus and would have come to accept him if it had not been for the direct opposition of the perverse Pharisees and other Jewish leaders." The effectiveness of such a position for the purposes of apologetic is patent.

David exercising this ministry, however, runs directly counter to popular, possibly Pharisaic, expectations and reveals a Son of David who is the servant and healer *par excellence*. Owing to the limited forms of the title (as reflected in the gospel's use of κύριος) it naturally began to be supplanted in Matthew's community by the use of κύριος. Thus, its usage in Matthew is more historical than liturgical, and reflects Matthew's apologetic concerns.

In general, the crowds' reaction to Son of David can best be described as a continuation of their response to his miracles and healings discussed in the last section. It represents a clear development or progression on their part in that their interest has begun to centre around Jesus. At 12:23 he is tentatively identified with the Son of David, which becomes full-blown acclaim in the Triumphal Entry, stopping just short of being a messianic confession.

Once again, an element of this is clearly christological. Their use of the title not only draws attention to Jesus but also, along with the suppliants' use of it, gives content to Matthew's conception of the Son of David. Being Israelites they are the people he has come to serve, and being sick and in need, are the people he has come to heal. The crowds' cry at 21:9 is particularly instrumental in drawing attention to the primacy of healing in Matthew's messianic portrayal.

There is also an apologetic focus. This emerges in two ways. First, the crowds' "progression" shows how close they were to penetrating Jesus' identity as Messiah, and how, given time, they would have been likely to do so. Second, it explains why they failed to recognize Jesus as the Messiah—it was because they saw in the Son of David merely a thaumaturge and not the Messiah. Had they recognized the true import of the Son of David's healings, they would have found the servant-Messiah and not the political conqueror they had been expecting.

7. PROPHET

7a. Prelude

As mentioned in the last section, the crowd's response to the people of

Jerusalem that "This is the prophet Jesus from Nazareth of Galilee" (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας 21:11) occurs immediately after Jesus' entry in Jerusalem. Given the prominence accorded to the question and the crowds' answer, it is obviously of prime significance for determining the reaction of the crowd. In order to do this, the discussion which follows will first consider the provenance of the passage, then the place of the Eschatological Prophet in Matthew. It will then examine 21:11, and conclude with the implications it has with respect to the crowds.⁴²⁸

The crowds' response at 21:11 is an integral part of the Triumphal Entry scene. Van Tilborg and Walker have disputed this, and claim that 21:10-11 ought to be separated from 21:9.⁴²⁹ This is doubtful however. The εἰσελθόντος (21:10) indicates that the entry is still in view, while the continuing mention of the crowds,⁴³⁰ and the recurring use of direct discourse with its express focus on Jesus, all suggest that it should be taken as a unity.

Both are also best regarded as a Matthean composition. By contrast, Meyer has argued that Matthew is depending on tradition here,⁴³¹ but the Matthean vocabulary⁴³² argues for composition by Matthew and so does the style. Prabhu observes that the use of the genitive absolute and the clear reminiscences of Mt 2:1-3 are Matthean.⁴³³ The only point where he finds a "traditional datum" is with προφήτης itself, and this is

⁴²⁸ In addition to the works cited below, see: John Knox, "The Prophet in New Testament Christology" in (R. A. Norris Jr., ed.) *Lux in Lumine: Essays to Honor W. Norman Pittenger*, (New York: Seabury Press, 1966) 23-34; Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM, 1973) 86-102; Franklin W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-examination" *JBL* 48 (1949) 285-299.

⁴²⁹ Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 145; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 63. For a contrary view see Prabhu, *Formula*, 157.

⁴³⁰ 21:8 ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος; 21:9 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες; 21:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι; cf. Mk 11:8 πολλοί; 11:9 οἱ προάγοντες.

⁴³¹ R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa. Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelisten* (Leipzig:1940) 137 #71 on the basis of an "Unterschied in Stil und Tenor". See also R. Meyer, "ὄχλος" TWNT 5, 587 #27 and Burger, *Davidsohn*, 85.

⁴³² Gundry, *Matthew*, 411 sees "ἐσεῖσθι, πάσα, πόλις and λέγουσα as part of Matthew's special vocabulary in 10 and οὗτός ἐστιν, crowds, prophets, Jesus' name, and Nazareth and Galilee in v.11. Prabhu, *Formula*, 152 calls it a "redactional composition" and see Schnider, *Prophet*, 102ff. as well.

⁴³³ Prabhu, *Formula*, 152.

on theological grounds: "προφήτης is not a Matthean title for Jesus".⁴³⁴ This ignores the fact that the word prophet is frequently associated with the crowds in the first gospel (14:5; 21:26; 21:46) in material which Matthew consciously reduplicates.⁴³⁵ In light of this the Matthean composition becomes evident.

7b. The Eschatological Prophet

If Matthew composed the account, what did he mean by it? Is Matthew simply having the crowds say that "this is the prophet from Nazareth, of whom you have already heard",⁴³⁶ or are they saying that "this is the 'eschatological prophet'?" The difference is not an inconsiderable one, for if it could be shown that the crowds understand Jesus as the "eschatological prophet", one would have to impute to them considerably more insight and understanding than if they simply regarded Jesus as "a prophet".⁴³⁷

While a number of commentators have seen 21:11 as a possible reference to the Eschatological Prophet or prophet like Moses,⁴³⁸ many of them do not explain what

⁴³⁴ Ibid., 152 "probably", contrast Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 63 #47 who speaks of "die redaktionelle Kennzeichnung Jesu als 'Prophet' in 21, 11, 46".

⁴³⁵ J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909) 171, categorizes this as one of the repeated formulas "which are used once by a Synoptist in common with one or both of the others, and are also used by that Synoptist independently in other parts of his narrative" (169 italics his). Matthew apparently derives it from Mk 11:32.

⁴³⁶ It is generally acknowledged that Jesus displayed certain "prophetic" characteristics. See the now classic exposition by C. H. Dodd, "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet" in *Mysterium Christi*, ed. G.K.A. Bell and A. Deissmann (Berlin, 1930) 67-86. See also E. Earle Ellis, "Prophecy in the New Testament Church and Today" in Panagopoulos, *Prophetic*, 46-57, 47 and the caution by W. G. Kümmel in *Theology of the New Testament*, tr. John E. Steely (London: SCM, 1974). It is safe to assume that the crowds' remark means more than that Jesus simply displayed one or two prophetic characteristics.

⁴³⁷ What is meant by the "eschatological prophet" will be discussed more thoroughly below.

⁴³⁸ To give a representative overview, the following regard it as a reference to the Eschatological Prophet: Bartnicki, "Carattere" 26; Cullmann, *Christology*, 34 though he acknowledges "that he is only a prophet, cannot be excluded"; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making* (London: SCM, 1980) 137-139; G. Friedrich, "προφήτης" *TDNT* VI 828-61, 846; Loymeyer, *Matthäus*, 297; Meyer, *Prophet*, 18-19; Sand, *Gesetz*, 141; Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 611; Schnider, *Prophet*, 54, 236-237. (As "messianic" Gundry, *Matthew*, 411-412; Schmid, *Matthäus*, 299-300; in a limited sense, Strecker, *Weg*, 268.)

The following consider it possible: Bonnard, *St. Matthieu*, 305; David Hill, *Matthew*, 293 and *New Testament Prophecy* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979) 51; Schweizer, *Matthew* 405.

These do not see the Eschatological Prophet here: David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 154-155; Davies, *SSM*, 189 #2; Félix Gils, *Jésus Prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*, (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1975) 25, 43 #1; Klostermann, *Matthäusevangelium*, 166. R. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten" *SE I*, 622-639, 624. Implicitly, *BAG*, s.v. "a prophet".

they understand by it, nor how it relates to 21:11. This naturally makes an examination of the question difficult, not least because of the complex, amorphous and sometimes contradictory nature of the sources which deal with the Eschatological Prophet. Related to this are methodological problems, since very often the questions that are asked about the Prophet have already determined what the answer will be,⁴³⁹ and messianic expectation was so varied in the first century, that, depending on the question, any number of different answers could emerge. As Volz remarks:

das fromme Judentum im Zeitalter Jesu Christi nicht eine einheitliche, sondern eine mannigfaltige 'Messiashoffnung' hatte, und es läßt sich vermuten, daß sich die verschiedenen eschatologischen Heilsgestalten auf verschiedene Kreise im Volk verteilt haben. Die verschiedenen Gruppen in Zeitalter Jesu werden sich ihren besonderen 'Messias', Erlöser, Heilbringer erdacht und ihn in sehr verschiedener Gestalt erwartet haben . . ."⁴⁴⁰

One solution to the problem has been to try to compound our knowledge by synthesizing the material. Yet if Volz's analysis is correct, such an approach hardly does justice to the *Mannigfaltigkeit* and diversity of first century expectation. In a recent article, Horsley has with some justice, therefore, criticized the "highly synthetic" treatments of the Eschatological Prophet by Cullmann and Hahn.⁴⁴¹

In light of this, the solution adopted here will be to take the breadth and

⁴³⁹ For an instance of this see Charles Perrot, "Un prophète comme l'un des prophètes (Mc 6:15)", in *De la Torah au Messie. Études d'exégèse et d'herméneutique bibliques offertes à Henri Cazelles*, ed. J. Doné, P. Grelot (Paris: Desclées, 1981) 417-423, who brings the "mosaic eschatological prophet" into a discussion of Mk 8:28 and, not surprisingly, emerges with it in his conclusions.

⁴⁴⁰ Paul Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Nach den Quellen der rabbinischen, apokalyptischen und apokryphen Literatur* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1934) 201. This assessment does not appear to have changed much in the last fifty years. Larry Hurtado, "The Study of New Testament Christology: Notes for the Agenda" in *SBL 1981 Seminar Papers*, (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981) 185-97, notes that "the Qumran materials have provided us with evidence also that the Soteriological hopes of Palestinian Jews were more complex (and confusing!) than we might have desired, and it is still not clear whether the questions about the nature of messianic expectations have been resolved" (187).

⁴⁴¹ Richard A. Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins" *JSNT* 26 (1986) 3-127, 20. On the other hand Horsley's own treatment of the Eschatological Prophet ("Like One of the Prophets of Old": Two types of Popular Prophets at the time of Jesus" *CBQ* 47 (1985) 435-463, 437-443) is a bit too summary and precipitate.

diversity of popular expectation into account, but to give primacy to what, in view of this expectation, is emphasized in the gospel. This should not only provide an insight into popular expectation,⁴⁴² but take cognizance of Matthew's own particular emphasis. (It therefore makes the not unreasonable presupposition that if the Endtime Prophet is to be found in Matthew, it will be related to the prophetic types Matthew includes in his gospel, rather than ones that he otherwise ignores.)

Of these prophetic types, the ones which receive most emphasis are Moses and Elijah. Matthew rules out Elijah⁴⁴³ for Jesus, so this leaves Moses. He is a natural choice as he played an important role in later Jewish speculation, and significantly, references and especially allusions to Moses are common in the first gospel.⁴⁴⁴ Commentators are naturally divided concerning the extent of these allusions, but many would see at least some in the Infancy Narratives and the Sermon on the Mount.⁴⁴⁵

On the strength of these references and allusions, H. M. Teeple has argued that they characterize Jesus as the Mosaic Eschatological Prophet.⁴⁴⁶ His argument, as shall be seen, runs afoul of several difficulties.

The first is one to which he himself draws attention, namely that "the prophecy

⁴⁴² Schnackenburg perceptively observes that "Für die damaligen volkstümlichen Gedanken über einen kommenden Propheten sind die Evangelien die beste Quelle für uns", "Erwartung", 622.

⁴⁴³ Matthew makes it clear that Jesus cannot be understood as the Elijanic Eschatological Prophet, since he is intent upon identifying John the Baptist with Elijah. Not only does Matthew cite Malachi 3:1 with respect to John (Q 11:10 [cf. Lk 7:27] and cp. Mk 1:2) but at 11:14, in a Matthean passage, he makes in Meier's words ("John", 397) "the clearest identification of the Baptist with Elijah within the New Testament". A similar equation is to be found at 17:10-13 where Matthew has reworked Mark.

⁴⁴⁴ On the place of Moses in later Jewish speculation see Volz, *Eschatologie*, 194-195, on Moses and Elijah together, 197. See too J. Jeremias, "Μωϋσῆς", *TWNT* IV 860-67. Deut 18:15, 18 was decisive for this sort of expectation, since it apparently promised the emergence of a prophet like Moses. (On the passage itself see Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 356ff.)

The explicit references to Moses in Matthew are less numerous than in the other two synoptic gospels (Mt 7, Mk 8, Lk 10). On the implicit allusions to Moses in Matthew, see P. Josef M. Kastner, *Moses im Neuen Testament*. Inaugural-Dissertation (München: Ludwig-Maximilians Universität, 1967) and Tadashi Saito, *Die Mosevorstellungen im Neuen Testament* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1977). Of these, Kastner's is more nuanced. Saito tends consistently to underestimate the force of the Moses motif in Matthew.

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. among others: Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 400-402; Kastner, *Moses*, 143-170; Kingsbury, *Structure*, 88-92; and Prabhu, *Formula*, 7-8 with the references there. On the Infancy Narrative in particular see Jeremias, "Μωϋσῆς", 874-875. On the Sermon on the Mount see esp. Davies, *SSM*, 25-108 and the list in Donaldson, *Mountain*, 253 #27.

⁴⁴⁶ Howard M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, JBLMS 10 (Philadelphia: SBL, 1957).

from Deuteronomy . . . is not mentioned in this Gospel".⁴⁴⁷ He may be overstating the case somewhat since 17:5 likely contains a reference to Deut. 18:15 which Matthew has taken over from Mark 9:7.⁴⁴⁸ Yet he is correct in saying that Matthew has not introduced the reference himself elsewhere—something the author of Luke-Acts has, in fact, done.⁴⁴⁹ Given Matthew's penchant for Old Testament citations, and the emphasis he gives to Moses, one might say that the verse is eloquent by its omission.

To make up for this deficiency, Teeple draws attention to instances where Matthew has emphasized Jesus' status as a prophet. He maintains that "the author of Matthew regarded Jesus as like Moses but did he believe that, like Moses, Jesus was a prophet? The answer is definitely "Yes," for not only does Matthew copy Mark's traditions in which Jesus is a prophet (Jesus is not called a "prophet" in the Q source), but he adds two others" [sc. 21:11, 10:41].⁴⁵⁰

Teeple's argument is suspect here. Do references to Jesus as *a prophet*⁴⁵¹ automatically suggest the Mosaic Eschatological Prophet? His argument might carry a modicum of conviction if he could relate any one of the "prophet" *Stellen* to a Mosaic motif. He is not able to do this however—the closest one might come is 16:14 Ἰερεμίαν ἢ ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν. Yet it seems unlikely in the extreme that Matthew would explicitly mention Jeremiah and confine Moses to the ranks of "one of the prophets".⁴⁵² As for 21:11 and 10:41, neither passage associates Jesus with Moses,

⁴⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 88.

⁴⁴⁸ Kastner, *Moses*, 129 - "ohne Zweifel Dt 18, 15-18 entnommen" errs in the other direction. Davies (*SSM* 50) "may recall Deut 18:15" is to be preferred. So too H. Riesenfeld, (*Jésus Transfiguré: L'Arrière-Plan du Récit Évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur*, (København: Einar Munksgaard, 1947) 270) "Il est . . . possible".

⁴⁴⁹ Cf. Acts 3:22; 7:37. In addition, Lindars, (*Apologetic*, 204) suggests that Luke's αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε (9:35) has been inverted so as to bring it into harmony with Deut 18:15.

⁴⁵⁰ Teeple, *Prophet*, 83.

⁴⁵¹ Only 21:11 is definite, the τῶν προφητῶν of 16:14 referring to a distinct group.

⁴⁵² The same objection can be tendered against Hahn's ready correlation of the Eschatological Prophet with the "New Moses". Apart from one instance, (*Hoheitstitel*, 401) he simply presents instances of Mosaic typology and assumes that they are sufficient to suggest the "Prophet", 400-402.

The one exception is where he relates Matthew's temptation pericope to Mark's where he has found a reference to the Eschatological Prophet (345f. and note 2). For all that, it is certainly questionable whether "die vierzigtätige Aufenthalt in der Wüste und auch der Dienst der Engel" (345) is sufficient to point exclusively to a Moses-Elijah typology (much less a direct correlation between Moses and the Eschatological Prophet). See the remarks by Haenchen, *Weg* 64; and Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son: An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash*, tr. John Toy CB (NT 2:1 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966) 43: "It would be unwise to assume that here we have a Moses—or even an Elijah-typology". W. D. Davies is of a similar opinion, "It is precarious to find even in the Matthean

and certainly the *onus probandi* rests with Teeple in attempting to make such a correlation.⁴⁵³

In fact, the only passage in Matthew where it appears that such a correlation might be made is at 17:5. W. D. Davies, in his careful study of the pericope, says that it is "possible, even probable, that we should understand the phrase in the light of Deut XVIII 15".⁴⁵⁴ Significantly, he goes on to show how in Matthew's account the figure of Moses is superseded. For one thing, Matthew emphasizes that Jesus is left alone (αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον 17:8) after Moses and Elijah leave, thereby showing that Jesus "has become the teacher unique, the 'New Moses'".⁴⁵⁵ Further, Matthew draws attention to Jesus' capacity to command by placing the disciples' epiphany after the *bath qôl* and not before it (17:6).⁴⁵⁶ Both of these features give emphasis to Jesus as teacher, and at the same time indicate that Jesus is greater than Moses. Herein lies the problem with seeing Jesus as the Eschatological Prophet. The latter is only a prophet like Moses⁴⁵⁷ whereas Jesus is greater than Moses—he is ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός (18:5; cf. 3:17). So even if there is some identification with the teaching role of the prophet (cf. 18:18) intended here, it is an identification that is ultimately of a negative kind, in that Matthew's intention is to show that Jesus is more than the Prophet, in the same sort of way that, in the antitheses, Jesus' teaching transcends that of Moses.⁴⁵⁸ For this reason it is unlikely that Matthew's account involves the Prophet at all—the

version of the temptation any convincing parallel between Jesus and Moses, although Jesus does re-enact the experience of the 'Son of God' the old Israel" (*SSM*, 48). For a different view of the temptation account based, instead, on an Adam typology see P. Pokorny, "The Temptation Stories and Their Intention" *NTS* 20 (1974) 115-127, 120-122.

⁴⁵³ His attempt to see the Eschatological Prophet at 10:41 is questionable. The context in the Mission Discourse suggests that it is better understood as positing a correlation between Jesus and the later community. See Brown, "Mission", 77; E. Cothenet, "Les prophètes chrétiens dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu" in Didier, *L'Évangile*, 281-308, 298-299; Davies, *SSM*, 97-98; Hill, *Prophecy*, 155.

⁴⁵⁴ Davies, *SSM* 53, cf. 50-56.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁷ Deut 18:15 LXX- προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε.

⁴⁵⁸ It is not clear whether Davies' remark "the characteristics of 'the Prophet' to come are ascribed by Matthew to Jesus as Messiah" (*SSM* 189 #2) is in line with this position or not. He does not say what the characteristics are, but if teaching were one, it would clearly fit, and be indicative of Matthew's tendency to discount "the Prophet" in favour of the Messiah. It is also worth noting that Davies sees no reference to "the Prophet" at 21:11—"such a generalized concept of a prophet is to be distinguished from that of an eschatological figure 'the Prophet'" (187).

comparison is better seen as one between Moses the teacher, and Jesus the authoritative teacher. On balance, therefore, it is most likely that Matthew does not equate Moses with the Eschatological Prophet,⁴⁵⁹ and, in Aune's words, "never attempts to identify Jesus with the eschatological prophet".⁴⁶⁰

Yet if this is the case, how are the Mosaic elements in the first gospel to be understood? They are best interpreted typologically. Jesus is not represented as the Prophet, but instead as the "Second Moses". And the formula which perhaps best elucidates this is one that Jeremias seizes upon: "Wie der erste Erlöser (Moses), so der letzte Erlöser (der Messias)".⁴⁶¹ This formula is particularly illuminating with the infancy narratives,⁴⁶² but informs the designation of Jesus as the "second Moses" in the gospel in general.⁴⁶³

To sum up, Matthew does not demonstrate a great deal of interest in the Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. In the one place where there may be a reference to the Eschatological Prophet as such, Matthew implicitly indicates that the Son is greater than the Prophet. Apart from this, Jesus is largely characterized as the "Second Moses".

7c. *The Eschatological Prophet at 21:11?*

The most extensive argument for seeing the Eschatological Prophet at 21:11 has

⁴⁵⁹ "There are indications of a Moses typology in both Matthew and Luke . . . But this parallel is not equivalent to a Messianism of Deut. 18", Lindars *Apologetic*, 205, see too, Saito, *Mosevorstellungen*, 71—"Es gibt aber kein Anzeichen dafür, daß unsere Geschichte durch den Gedanken des eschatologischen Propheten wie Mose beeinflußt wird"; see too Kastner, *Moses*, 171 "Wie für den synoptischen Stoff gilt auch hier [i.e. for the Matthean *Sondergut*], daß man die Mosestypologie nicht auf die Vorstellung vom eschatologischen Prophet wie Moses reduziert".

⁴⁶⁰ Aune, *Prophecy*, 155. That 21:11 conforms with this judgement will be show below.

⁴⁶¹ Jeremias, "Μωυσης" 864. See #140 for the passages on which he draws. Daube, *Rabbinic*, 11, notes that this formula "is not extant in utterances prior to the third century A.D. but that may be accidental". In any case, the principle expressed by this formula corresponds well with the pattern in Matthew.

⁴⁶² See Kastner, *Moses*, 170-171, cf. Jeremias, ("Μωυσης" 875) "zweiten Moses".

⁴⁶³ Kastner, *Moses*, 142-143. Yet if Jesus is the "Second Moses", why then is he not the Eschatological Prophet? To this it can be replied that the difference resides in the nature of typology. The "Second Moses" designation indicates only that Matthew is drawing a correlation between Moses and Jesus. Matthew makes it clear however (as was seen above) that this is only a correlation—Jesus is indisputably greater than Moses. With the Eschatological Prophet however, it is not a correlation that is intended but rather, an identification. One could very well say that Jesus is like the Eschatological Prophet (and Matthew may in fact be doing so at 17:5) but this is very different from saying Jesus is the Prophet.

been put forward by A. Sand.⁴⁶⁴ He maintains that the presence of the definite article ὁ with προφήτης is a reference to the endtime prophet,⁴⁶⁵ while ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ ought to be taken as an allusion to the *Reflexionszitat* at 2:23. According to Sand, 2:23 is itself to be understood as a reference to the Old Testament passages he interprets as an "Hinweise auf den endzeitlichen Propheten".⁴⁶⁶

Sand's initial argument does not carry much conviction. In the first place, the very formulation of the passage suggests that it is referring to "Jesus, the Galilean prophet" and not "the prophet Jesus who is from Nazareth of Galilee".⁴⁶⁷ As Schackenburg argues, "In Mt 21:11 erklärt sich der Artikel durch den Anschluß des Namens Jesus: der Prophet Jesus von Nazareth aus Galiläa".⁴⁶⁸ Matthew has the crowds identify Jesus as the Galilean prophet, and not as the Eschatological Prophet.⁴⁶⁹

That this is the case can be seen some thirty verses later at 21:46 where the crowds, Matthew tells us, "held him to be a prophet" (... ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον). It hardly needs to be said that it is Matthew speaking here, telling us what the crowds thought. From the indefinite εἰς προφήτην⁴⁷⁰ it is evident that the

⁴⁶⁴ Sand, *Gesetz*, 140-142.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 140.

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁴⁶⁷ See B. Weiss, *Matthäus-Evangeliums*, 359. Sand, *Gesetz*, 140 does recognize that the article also serves as a "Näherbestimmung", but it should be regarded entirely as such.

⁴⁶⁸ Schnackenburg, "Erwartung", 627.

⁴⁶⁹ It is noteworthy that both Nazareth and Galilee figure in Matthew's version of Peter's denial (26:69-75). Here Matthew has altered Mark's account in several telling ways. In 26:69 it is Jesus and not Peter (as in Mk 14:70) who is identified as a Galilean—Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου. This is not insignificant, for Γαλιλαίου is a *hapax* in the NT. There is a further change at 26:71 where Matthew refashions Mark's μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ ἦσθα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (14:67) into Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου. Apart from the inversion in order, these designations have a remarkable affinity with 21:11, and again suggest that the main intention of that passage is to identify Jesus by his place of origin. Peter's accusers know who Jesus is because the crowds told them as Jesus entered the city. In addition, the geographical elements probably contribute to the humility motif already developed in the Triumphal Entry. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*, SNTSMS 27 (Cambridge: University Press, 1974) 154, remarks that "Neither Nazareth nor Galilee would have been understood in the primitive Christian communities as an appropriate background for the Messiah . . .", but adds after (156) that the early church made this scandal part of its message. If so, perhaps this feature has been included in the paradox of the Triumphal Entry—the humble Messiah comes from an insignificant city (On Nazareth cf. Jn 1:46 see Clemens Kopp, *Die Heiligen Stätten der Evangelien* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1959) 89, and W. D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974) 239) in a despised district (cf. Jn 7:52; Nedarim 2:4; Erubin Vil [53b]; G. Steinburger, "Galilee-Land of Salvation", in Davies, *Land*, 409-438 and G. Vermes, *Jesus*, 42-57) though, in point of fact he was actually born in the city of David (Mt 2:1).

⁴⁷⁰ On εἰς as a semitism see BDF 157(5); Moulton, *Grammar*, III, 247, 266; Robertson, *Grammar*, 481.

Eschatological Prophet is not in view here.⁴⁷¹ Rather than suppose that this is a contradiction in Matthew's editorial work, it is preferable to assume that he is making explicit what was already stated at 21:11—the crowds regarded Jesus as a prophet.⁴⁷² The proximity of the remark is hardly fortuitous, especially given the changes Matthew has made to Mark 12:12 so as to include the phrase here. It becomes even more worthy of remark when it is recognized that this is the only time this particular phrase is used of Jesus (vs. 14:5 and 21:26 of the Baptist). All these features indicate, therefore, that the Eschatological Prophet is not in view at 21:11.

Sand's second argument is rather more tenuous, especially his first assumption. He suggests that 21:11 refers back to 2:23 (καὶ ἔλθὼν κατέκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ· ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται.) It is true that Ναζαρέτ occurs at 2:23, but if (as Sand claims) Matthew were intent on drawing a connection with "what was spoken by the prophets" would he not have been more likely to use the *Stichwort* Ναζωραῖος? The word means ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ⁴⁷³ and is one which Matthew has used elsewhere at 26:71. The fact that he has not used it at 21:11 suggests that he intended no connection to be made.

One must also question the next assumption in his argument. He claims that the Old Testament *נָצַר* Stellen behind 2:23 refer to the Eschatological Prophet. There are several difficulties here. He is aware that "the identification of the biblical allusion in the cryptic . . . Mt 2:23 is surely one of the best known *crucis* of Synoptic exegesis."⁴⁷⁴ For this reason he foregoes selecting an actual reference, but discusses Isaiah 11:1⁴⁷⁵ and the Nazirite material in the Samson tradition.⁴⁷⁶ Yet these represent

⁴⁷¹ Cullmann, *Christology*, 31 ". . . no mention is made of the Eschatological Prophet" at 21:46.

⁴⁷² Sand (*Gesetz*, 141-142) tries to draw the notion of the Prophet out of the Parable of the Vineyard, but this is quite unlikely. Michel Hubaut's remarks, *La Parole des Vignerons Homicides* (Paris: Gabalda, 1976) 44, make this very clear: "Matthieu remplace ἔσχατον par ὅσπερ et le place en début de phrase. C'est excellent, car ὅσπερ exprime, aussi bien que ἔσχατον, l'idée que le fils vient dernier lieu et que l'enjeu est décisif, mais il élimine la nuance 'eschatologique' que ἔσχατον connote et qui ne convient pas tellement à cet endroit".

⁴⁷³ Matthew, "always understands Ναζωραῖος, as ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ" Prabhu, *Formula*, 201.

⁴⁷⁴ Prabhu, *Formula*, 193.

⁴⁷⁵ Following Gundry, *Use*, 97-104.

just two of many possibilities,⁴⁷⁷ and it may even be, as Strecker argues, that Matthew at 2:23 has no specific Old Testament passage in mind.⁴⁷⁸ All told, Sand's arguments are just too hypothetical and embrace too many assumptions to be plausible. In light of this it is preferable to conclude that at 21:11 there is no reference to the Eschatological Prophet.⁴⁷⁹

7d. *The Prophets and the Crowds*

If the crowds do not see in Jesus the Eschatological Prophet, why then has Matthew introduced this motif at 21:11 and 21:46? One obvious reason is to qualify the crowds' acclaim, but that, in itself, is hardly sufficient. A more promising reason is to parallel Jesus and John the Baptist. In Matthew, the crowds regard both as "prophets" (14:5, 21:26 - John the Baptist, 21:11, 46 - Jesus) and much the same phrase is used of both, except at 21:11.⁴⁸⁰ The fact that 21:26 and 21:46 are situated in such proximity to each other also emphasizes the calculated attempt to parallel the two. This parallelism has often been noted in other elements of their respective ministries, such as the use of identical exhortations,⁴⁸¹ and is characteristic of Matthew's portrayal.

⁴⁷⁶ Following Schweizer, "Er wird Nazoräer heissen" in E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica: Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963) 51-55, esp. 53-55.

⁴⁷⁷ For a good survey including alternatives Sand does not discuss, see Prabhu, *Formula*, 192-216, and cf. McConnell, *Law*, 114-117; G. F. Moore, "Nazarene and Nazareth" Appendix B in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, vol. I, Prolegomena I, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan, 1920) 426-432; Stendahl, *School*, 103-104; 198-199.

⁴⁷⁸ Strecker, *Weg*, 61 argues that "hier eine bestimmte Schriftstelle nicht angezogen zu sein scheint". See in addition Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 66-67.

⁴⁷⁹ In addition to those cited above, the following do not see 21:11 as a reference to the Eschatological Prophet. Some regard it as a misunderstanding on the part of the crowds: C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* 2nd ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1978) 416; E. Boring, *Sayings*, 46; Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* tr. G.R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971) 89; Joachim Gnilka, "Das Verstockungsproblem nach Matthäus 13,13-15" in W. Eckert et al. (hrsg.), *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament. Exegetische und systematische Beiträge* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1967) 119-128, 125 #4; L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die Typologische Deutung des A.T. im Neuen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1939) 71 #2, "ein Prophet"; Kingsbury, "Title", 600; Lindars, *Apologetic*, 204, "the idea is used for local colour"; Murphy O'Connor, "Structure", 377 #44; Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 64; Werner, "Hosanna", 108 (implicitly); Zarella, "l'entrata", 125.

⁴⁸⁰ 14:5 ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

21:26 φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον, πάντες γὰρ ὡς προφήτην ἔχουσιν τὸν Ἰωάννην.

21:46 ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπεὶ εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

The very similarity of 14:5 and 21:46, with the explicit paralleling of Jesus and John, is itself a cogent argument against seeing Jesus as the Prophet.

⁴⁸¹ Compare 3:2 with 4:17. Μετανοεῖτε, ἥγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν and cf. Hahn, *Hoheitstitel*, 380; and for more detailed studies of this parallelism see Meier, "John", 386-402;

The key element of this parallelism is the fate of Jesus and John: each dies a violent death. John's death assumes special significance in this regard since Matthew's introduction of προφήτης at 14:5 (against Mk)⁴⁸² transmutes his death into a prophet's death. John's death, in turn, prefigures Jesus' own.⁴⁸³ Instead of placing John's body in a tomb as happens in Mark (6:29), his disciples come and announce the Baptist's death to Jesus, whereupon Jesus withdraws. Both actions are calculated to foreshadow Jesus' own impending fate. As Meier well puts it, "when the Baptist's disciples 'announce' John's death to Jesus, they are announcing Jesus' death as well".⁴⁸⁴ This correlation, in fact, seems to be the whole point of the parallelism between the two—to bring out the fate of John and Jesus as prophets of Israel.⁴⁸⁵

The same theme is clearly in evidence at 17:12. Matthew retains Mark's basic idea concerning the Baptist (ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν cf. Mk 9:13) but goes on to speak of the suffering of the Son of Man—οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. John's and Jesus' suffering are once again set side by side, with the initial allusion to John's death illumining what Matthew means by πάσχειν with respect to Jesus.

Why then has Matthew introduced this concern with the violent fates of Jesus and John the Baptist? The clearest answer is that Matthew wanted to relate the deaths of Jesus and John the Baptist with the "violent fate of the prophets". This was a conception, current in the first century, which held that all the prophets suffered a violent fate. As Kessler well expresses it "In der lebendigen Überlieferung des Judentums auch der Zeit Jesu gabe es eine seltsame, historisch nicht gedeckte (Neh 9,26 erstmals ausgebildete) Aussage, daß nicht nur den einem oder anderen einzelnen

Trilling, "Täufertradition", 382-386; Wink, *John*, 33-35. (Against the presence of such parallelism cf. Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 90, 107). Meier rightly notes that Matthew is, nonetheless, careful to subordinate John to Jesus ("John", 400).

⁴⁸² Cf. Mk 6:14-29. Note Matthew's omission of 6:20.

⁴⁸³ Meier, "John", 400.

⁴⁸⁴ *Ibid.*. See too Schönle, *Jesus*, 147; Trilling, "Täufertradition", 274; Wink, *John*, 27.

⁴⁸⁵ This is adverted to by both Meier, "John", 402 and Trilling, *Täufertradition*, 274. Aune, *Prophecy*, 157-159 suggests that the theme of a prophet's fate is not developed by Matthew, but he has very possibly overlooked this correlation. Contrast Trilling's remarks (*Wahre*, 80)—"Ein zweites 'Dogma' bei Matthäus ist das der Prophetenmorde."

Propheten, sondern den Propheten Israels generell von ihrem eigenem Volk Israel ein gewaltsames Geschick; ja selbst Tötung widerfuhr . . .".⁴⁸⁶ Matthew's emphasis of both the prophetic character and violent deaths of the Baptist and Jesus would certainly indicate that he wished to align both with this tradition.⁴⁸⁷

What then are the implications for the crowds? Initially their response appears favourable. Their belief that John and Jesus were prophets consistently holds the leaders in check, the latter "fearing" the ὄχλοι (14.5; 21:26, 46). At a surface level, therefore, their response is one that is well-disposed to Jesus and the Baptist.

At a deeper level, however, their attitude is inadequate, and what is more, culpable. It was demonstrated above that the crowds failed to heed Jesus' call to hear (11:15) and to recognize John as περισσότερον προφήτου. This is decisive for Matthew, as Schönle indicates, because they have failed to recognize the inbreaking of the messianic age.⁴⁸⁸ Related to this, of course, is their failure to recognize who Jesus is. Wink rightly notes that "the identification of John with Elijah is only a consequence of the identification of Jesus as the Messiah . . . John is not Elijah as such, but rather the Elijah of the Messiah".⁴⁸⁹ This is a failure of recognition that continues up to and beyond the Triumphal Entry. Jesus for them, too, is only "a prophet". Thus the first failure on the part of the crowds is one of recognition.

That this is a significant omission for Matthew can be inferred from 17:12.

⁴⁸⁶ Hans Kessler, *Die theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1970) 232. Much of this conception was derived from a current "Life of the Prophets". On this and the conception see H. J. Schoeps, "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde" in *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Tübingen: 1950) 126-143; see in addition H. A. Fischel, "Martyrer and Prophet" *JQR* 37 (1946-1947) 265-280, 263-386; J. Dupont, *Les Béatitudes: II La Bonne Nouvelle* (Paris: Gabalda, 1969) 287-317. On this conception in the Q material see M. L. Gubler, *Die Frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu. Eine Motivesgeschichtliche Darstellung aufgrund der neueren exegetischen Forschung* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1977) 10-27. On the conception in Matthew see the major work by Odil Hannes Steck—*Israel und das Gewaltvolle Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, WMANT 23 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967) as well as Garland, *Intention*, 179-187 and Douglas R. A. Hare, *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, SNTSMS 6 (Cambridge: University Press, 1967) 137-141.

⁴⁸⁷ Edwards, *Sign*, 98 finds an interesting correlation between Jesus and Jonah τοῦ προφήτου (12:39 Mt's addition): "the mention of the fact that Jonah was a prophet in that pericope where Matthew stresses the suffering of Jonah and Jesus . . . would point to the passion of Jesus as the significant element in the Jonah comparison."

⁴⁸⁸ Schönle, *Jesus*, 129.

⁴⁸⁹ Wink, *John*, 32.

Here Matthew has added ἀλλὰ ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. In other words, if they had known who he was, "they" would not have done to him whatever they pleased. John's martyrdom follows on their ignorance. (This very fact also explains why the ὄχλοι must remain ignorant.)

More weighty is the crowd's partial responsibility for the deaths of John and Jesus. At one level, it exists in the very description of the two as prophets. This identification, in spite of its initially favourable impression, takes on sinister undertones. In light of the above paradigm of the violent fate of the prophets, it is required that Israel's prophets be persecuted or killed by their own people. Hence the fact that the crowds recognize the Baptist or Jesus simply as prophets, or even more, proclaim Jesus as such (21:11), is ominous. It represents the first step of a process that will culminate in Jesus' death and which culminated in John's.

Yet the crowds do not merely proclaim Jesus as prophet, they also become involved in his death. This too is articulated clearly at 17:12—the Son of Man shall also suffer at their hands (ὅπ' αὐτῶν). It was shown⁴⁹⁰ above that the αὐτῶν here refers to Israel as a whole, and this naturally includes the crowds⁴⁹¹—an identification otherwise confirmed by 27:24,25. The crowds, therefore, as part of Israel, ultimately play their part in enacting the "violent fate of the prophets".⁴⁹² Their proclamation of Jesus as prophet simply represents the first act.⁴⁹³

Thus it has to be said with respect to 21:11, that it plays a cardinal role in the Triumphal Entry, and one that stands in opposition to Son of David. "Son of David" in the crowds' mouth encapsulates much of the interaction between the crowds and Jesus prior to the Triumphal Entry. On the other hand, the crowds' use of prophet anticipates the passion and their role in it. For these reasons one might regard the Triumphal Entry

⁴⁹⁰ See above, n.196.

⁴⁹¹ This fact is borne out by the role of the crowds in the Passion Narrative, as shall be seen below. It is true that the crowd was not immediately involved in John's death, but in this instance it would perhaps be safe to say that their leaders represented them. There is no doubt about the crowds' participation in Jesus' death at 27:24f..

⁴⁹² Schönle, *Jesus*, 147, astutely remarks that "für Matthäus zwar das Auftreten des Johannes und Jesu die Erfüllung der prophetischen Verheißungen Israels bringt, sich in ihrem Geschick aber zugleich auch das Schicksal Israels als eines Volkes von Prophetenmördern erfüllt."

⁴⁹³ Cf. Künzel, *Gemeindeverständnis*, 63.

as something of a "hinge", joining the two disparate qualities of the crowds' behaviour. It also suggests that the very moment of the crowds' clearest perception is immediately followed by a movement away from it. As soon as they got close they began to withdraw again.

Conclusion

From the foregoing it can be concluded that Matthew shows little, if any interest in the notion of the Eschatological Prophet, and it is clear that this idea is not in view at 21:11. More important for Matthew is the paradigm of the "violent fate of the prophets", one which he uses to elucidate the fates of John the Baptist, and of Jesus in particular. Although very much an implicit connexion, Matthew connects the crowds' use of the designation with John's and especially with Jesus' death at the hands of their own people.

It is evident, therefore, that the title "prophet" is not primarily a christological designation in Matthew, at least with respect to the ὄχλοι. Rather, the importance of the term, as seen in Matthew's conjunction of the crowds with the designation, is *heilsgeschichtlich*. Through it Matthew introduces a note of historic inevitability. Because Israel had always persecuted the prophets sent to her, it was inevitable, given the characterization of John and Jesus as prophets, that it would happen again. And since the crowds comprised part of Israel, it was inevitable that, with respect to Jesus, they would forego their one-time support of Jesus and end up putting him to death, just as John the Baptist was put to death. Ultimately, Matthew ties these events to an overarching historical pattern and explains them in that light. And there is little doubt that Matthew situates this pattern in the overall plan of God—what he describes is simply the outworking of that plan.

8. MATTHEW 13

The next component of the gospel to be examined is Matthew's treatment of

the crowds in chapter 13, the third of the so-called Five Great Discourses.⁴⁹⁴ As the relation of the crowds to the discourses has not yet been examined, our discussion will begin with that. It will then consider the place of the crowds in the first portion of the chapter.

8a. *The Crowds and the Great Discourses*

Chapter 13 is unique amongst the five "Great Discourses"⁴⁹⁵ in Matthew insofar as it is the only one which is explicitly directed at the crowds. Yet even if they are the express recipients here, it has been argued that the crowds are also frequently the tacit recipients of other discourses. David Barr contends that each discourse "is set off from the preceding narrative either by reference to the crowds or the phrase, 'the disciples came to him' - usually both."⁴⁹⁶ In fact, he finds them mentioned at the beginning of all but the fourth discourse (Ch. 18) "where their presence would be inappropriate".⁴⁹⁷ Keegan, for his part, would confine their presence to two and a half discourses - the first, the second, and half of the third.⁴⁹⁸ Obviously the solution to

⁴⁹⁴ For examinations of Matthew 13 see: B. Bacon, "The Matthean Discourse in Parables, Mt. 13:1-52", *JBL* 46 (1927) 237-65, Lamar Cope, *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven* CBQMS 5, (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1976) 13-30; Dupont, "Chapitre"; Birger Gerhardsson, "The Seven Parables in Matthew 13", *NTS* 19 (1973) 16-37; Kingsbury, *Parables*; Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 93-149; Gary Phillips, *Enunciation and the Kingdom of Heaven: Text, Narration and Hermeneutic in the Parables of Matthew 13*, Ph.d. Dissertation, Vanderbilt University (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1981) and *idem*, "History and Text: The Reader in Context in Matthew's Parables Discourse" in K. H. Richards (ed.), *SBL 1983 Seminar Papers* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983) 415-37; David Wenham, "The Structure of Matthew 13", *NTS* 25 (1979) 516-22; W. Wilkens, "Die Redaktion des Gleichniskapitels Mark. 4 durch Matth.", *TZ* 20 (1964) 304-27.

⁴⁹⁵ By "Great Discourses" (the designation is at least as old as Streeter (*The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1927, 261) I mean the five which end with the formula καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς - 7:28; 11:1; 13:54; 19:1; 26:1. Luz' (*Matthew I* 455#5) suggestion that the formula might derive from Q is perhaps worthy of consideration given Matthew's penchant for repeating phrases from his sources. cf. Hawkins, *Horae*, 169-72).

Articles about the discourses and their relation to Matthew's overall structure are legion. For a recent discussion and bibliography see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*; 58-72, though, inevitably, the triadic arrangement they themselves offer does not quite convince either. It is perhaps best to recognize the presence of the five discourses in Matthew and leave it at that. The very profusion - and variety - of theories is itself a suggestive argument against there being one over-arching structural rationale to the gospel. Cf. the remarks by Stanton, "Origin", 1905.

⁴⁹⁶ David Barr "The Drama of Matthew's Gospel" *TD* 24 (1976) 349-59, 351. It needs to be mentioned that Barr is not primarily interested in the crowds *per se*, but as a narrative motif, which signals the start of a discourse.

⁴⁹⁷ Barr, "Drama", 358#14.

⁴⁹⁸ Keegan, "Formulae", 423-24. Keegan is interested in how the crowds are associated with the discourses. It is not surprising, given his findings, that he relates them to Kingsbury's 'turning point' theory.

this question depends on two factors; first, where the discourses begin, and second, whether a mere reference to the presence of the crowds must dictate that they were recipients of the discourse.

The first question is a vexed one, because although Matthew makes the endings of the discourses evident through his closing formulae, the beginnings of the discourses are not always readily discerned.⁴⁹⁹ Keegan's attempt to find distinctive markers at the beginning of each discourse is, ultimately, not convincing.⁵⁰⁰ As France has rightly objected, the markers Keegan posits are overly vague. While Matthew indubitably employs certain narrative motifs as signals to his readers, these are not, of themselves, sufficiently unequivocal to serve as markers.⁵⁰¹ What this means, in effect, is that the beginnings of the discourses will continue to be a matter of dispute.

The answer to the second question is also problematic, in that Matthew sometimes gives mixed signals. For instance, who are the intended recipients of the Sermon on the Mount? Although the crowds are mentioned, is the discourse directed at them or the disciples? It is evident from 7:28 that they heard the discourse,⁵⁰² yet less clear that it was aimed at them in the first place. This is largely because the participial introduction found here - Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους κτλ is itself ambiguous in Matthew.⁵⁰³ The occurrence of the phrase at 9:36 prompts Jesus' compassionate outburst, yet at 8:18 it serves as the motive for Jesus' withdrawal to the other side. Is Jesus' ascent of the mountain to be understood as an attempt to withdraw from the crowds, or an attempt to find an appropriate venue for teaching?⁵⁰⁴ The latter is

⁴⁹⁹ Keegan, "Formulae", 416#6,7 observes that the start of the Missionary Discourse has been situated by various commentators over a stretch of nine verses (9:35 - 10:5) with similar problems affecting the other discourses (the Sermon on the Mount (4:23,25; 5:1), the Community Discourse (17:22, 24; 18:1), Final Discourse (23:1; 24:1; 24:3))

⁵⁰⁰ Keegan, "Formulae", 428-29.

⁵⁰¹ R.T. France, *Matthew*, 142-43. For a helpful chart of these markers see Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 411. As the chart makes clear, these features extend over a wide range of verses proximate to (or part of!) each of the discourses, but do not offer an unequivocal indication of where exactly the discourses begin.

⁵⁰² 7:28 has been transposed from its synagogue setting in Mark (Mk 1:21-22) and Mark's impersonal ἐξεπλήσσοντο has been applied to the crowds. See Bultmann *HST* 333; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 724.

⁵⁰³ So too, of course is the αὐτοὺς at 5:2 which might well include the crowds.

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. Schneider, *TDNT* I 519 s.v. ἀναβαίω and W. Foerster *TDNT* V 485 s.v. ὄρος.

probably closer to the sense of 5:1.

Nevertheless, the question of the audience of the Sermon on the Mount has provoked an entire spectrum of views.⁵⁰⁵ Some emphasize the disciples,⁵⁰⁶ others, the crowds,⁵⁰⁷ but most commentators rightly recognize that it is directed at both. Trilling puts this fittingly when he affirms that "Jesus speaks to all his hearers of the true will of God, which they must all perform, but which the disciples have already begun to perform."⁵⁰⁸

Are the crowds also to be regarded as co-recipients of the Mission Discourse? Keegan remarks that the crowds "are placed on the scene at 9:36 and never removed".⁵⁰⁹ Yet is this of itself sufficient to make them recipients? Apart from their being mentioned at 9:36, Matthew gives no indication whatever that the crowds hear Jesus, or are intended to. Instead, Matthew gives strong indications that the discourse is directed solely at the disciples. Jesus is described first as speaking to his disciples (9:37), and then summoning his twelve disciples (10:1). After the discourse, he is described as having finished instructing his twelve disciples (11:1).⁵¹⁰ With audience markers as explicit and as unambiguous as these, it would seem more appropriate to suppose that the crowds were not included. Why then are the crowds mentioned at 9:36? The most likely answer is that they serve as the rationale for the mission and Jesus' discourse to his disciples. Once they have performed this function, they are

⁵⁰⁵ This extends to the question of Matthew's sources. Strecker, (*Bergpredigt*, 26,180) maintains that in Q both the crowds and the disciples were the hearers (cf. Mosley, "Audiences" 147; Donaldson, *Mountain* 110; Polag, *Fragmenta Q*, 32-33). On the other hand, Bultmann, *HST*, 333; Schweizer, *Matthew*, 78; and Dupont, "Chapitre", 256#83 (cont. p. 257), all hold that the disciples were the original recipients. Given the changes Matthew has made to 7:28 the latter alternative seems preferable.

⁵⁰⁶ Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 45; McNeile, *Matthew*, 99; Manson, *Sayings*, 47; Marguerat, *Jugement*, 173, among others

⁵⁰⁷ Schweizer, *Matthew*, 78-79.

⁵⁰⁸ Trilling, *Matthew*, I, 61. For related views, see Pierre Bonnard, *L'Évangile*, 54; Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 109; Jan Lambrecht, *Ich Aber Sage Euch: Die Bergpredigt als programatische Rede Jesu, Mt 5-7, Lk 6:20-49* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984) 28-29; Patte, *Matthew*, 62; Schmid, *Matthäus*, 74; Hans Windisch, *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount*, tr. S.M. Gilmour (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951), 63-64.

⁵⁰⁹ Keegan, "Formulae", 423, and more generally Barr, "Drama", 351.

⁵¹⁰ In each verse μαθηταί has been added (9:37 // 10:2 the seventy; 10:1 // Mk 6:7; Lk 9:1; 11:1 no //) The λέγει at 9:37 is probably derived from Q (cf. Luke's ἔλεγεν 10:2 to the 70) cf. Polag, *Fragmenta Q*, 44-45. Matthew's προσκαλεσάμενος 10:1 // Mk 6:7 προσκαλεῖται, Lk 9:1 συγκαλεσάμενος. The conclusion at 11:1 is without parallel.

subordinated to the background. In this respect, Matthew's method of dealing with them is not much different from the soliloquy in a modern play. Even though there may be other actors onstage, they are understood not to hear because they have been subordinated to the action which is taking place in the foreground. And, generally speaking, Matthew's concern is almost exclusively with the foreground in his gospel.⁵¹¹

The third discourse in the gospel is the parable discourse. As was noted above, it is the only one in which the crowds are singled out as the main recipient. It is also the discourse with the most intrusions of narrative. At 13:10-17 the disciples approach Jesus and ask him why he speaks to the crowds in parables. After the parables of the Tares, Mustard Seed and Leaven, Jesus leaves the crowds and goes into a house where the disciples join him for the remainder of the discourse. This change of setting and audience however, is made very explicit. The crowds are expressly mentioned in the concluding passage at 13:34 which marks the end of the first part of the discourse (13:34 (cp. Mk 4:33 αὐτοῖς⁵¹²), 13:36), and are again explicitly mentioned at 13:36 where Jesus is described as leaving them (Τότε ἀφείλ τοὺς ὄχλους [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν).

As the second part of the discourse is clearly aimed at the disciples, what of the interlude at 13:10-17? Are the crowds privy to Jesus' remarks about parables at 13:10-17 and the interpretation of the parable of the Sower (13:18-23) which follows? The προσελθόντες⁵¹³ at 13:10 suggests that the disciples, in approaching Jesus, have distanced themselves from the crowds.⁵¹⁴ This impression is further strengthened by

⁵¹¹ See Bultmann's astute remarks about how "illusory" the timeframe of the gospel is, as well as how dependent Matthew is on Mark for his geography and his outline of the life of Jesus (*HST* 351-53).

⁵¹² "Ici [sc. 13:34] du moins, *Mt* a pris soin d'ajouter le mot "foules", qui se ne trouvait pas dans le parallèle *Mc*." Dupont, "Le Chapitre des Paraboles", *NRT* 89 (1967) 800-20, 816.

⁵¹³ Matthew appears to forget that Jesus was on a boat. One commentator has suggested that the disciples were on the boat with Jesus - cf. Grundmann, *Matthäus*, 340. Gnllka (*Matthäusevangelium* I 483) is probably right in saying that "nicht die historische Situation diktiert die Feder...sondern der Inhalt von Frage und Antwort."

⁵¹⁴ "Doch markiert Matthäus 13,10 durch προσελθόντες eine Distanzierung der Jünger von der Volksmenge." (Hans-Josef Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*, NTAbh 13, (Münster: Aschendorff, 1978) 244); Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 90.

Matthew's use of pronouns - the αὐτοῖς of 13:10, and especially the ἐκείνοις of 13:11, when contrasted with the ὑμῖν or ὑμῶν (13:11; 13:16) used of the disciples, suggest that the crowds are far removed from the situation.⁵¹⁵ As the interpretation of the parable of the Sower is also addressed to ὑμεῖς (13:18) it, too, is aimed solely at the disciples.⁵¹⁶ So even in the part of the discourse directed at the crowds, there is a substantial portion which is intended exclusively for the disciples.

The crowds are not mentioned near the outset of the "community" discourse.⁵¹⁷ If chapter 23 is to be regarded as part of the final discourse⁵¹⁸ then the crowds are recipients, since they and the disciples are addressed jointly at 23:1.⁵¹⁹ The crowds remain auditors until the end of the chapter. This situation alters at the beginning of the next chapter (24:1-2), where there is a change of scene, after which the disciples are described as coming to him privately (κατ' ἰδίαν // Mk 13:3) at 24:3. Here again, the crowds, as in Chapter 13, would only be present for part of the discourse.⁵²⁰

The problem is, that chapter 23 is not usually regarded as a component of the last discourse. Those who do regard it as such, argue that the change of audience and setting found here is not uncommon in Matthew's great discourses, since the very same thing happens in chapter 13. Krentz has also argued that Matthew's omission of Mark's pericope of the Widow's Mite (Mk 12:41-44) indicates that Matthew wishes to create a direct link between Chapters 23 and 24. The resulting discourse can then be considered a commentary on the temple controversies and their implications for the disciples.

⁵¹⁵ Robertson (*Grammar*, 707) and Moulton (*Grammar*, III 45) indicate that ἐκείνοις in this configuration is commonly used to refer to those who are absent.

⁵¹⁶ Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable* (Fortress, 1988) 66-67. Once again, Matthew's practice of bringing certain characters to the foreground suggests that they alone are being singled out for discussion (except, that is, when he introduces others later who are also said to have heard, such as the disciples at 13:10, who had not previously been mentioned).

⁵¹⁷ The discourse is set apart from the references to the crowds which precede and follow it (17:14; 19:2) by changes in setting (17:24 no //; 19:1 // Mk 10:1).

⁵¹⁸ Barr ("Drama", 352) is not alone in regarding chapter 23 as part of the Final Discourse. See also E. Krentz, "Community and Character: Matthew's Vision of the Church" *SBL 1987 Seminar Papers*, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 565-73, 567; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 44; and Kari Syreeni, *Making*, 96. C.H. Lohr ("Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew" *CBQ* 23 (1961) 403-35, 427) finds it suits his chiastic arrangement.

⁵¹⁹ The disciples have been added; Mark only mentions the "great crowd" 12:37.

⁵²⁰ Krentz, "Community", 567.

This may be so, but it seems improbable. While it is true that there is a change of setting and auditors at 13:36, the narrative intrusion into the discourse is brief. And apart from the narrative elements at 13:10, which are minimal, the only other intrusion of narrative into one of the discourses is at 18:21a - "Then Peter came up and said to him..." which is not so much a resumption of narrative as a mechanism for introducing the Parable of the Unforgiving Servant. In all of these cases, the narrative has been kept to a minimum. At 24:1-3a, however, the narrative interlude is far more extensive. Nor is it simply a case of a change of setting and auditors — there is also a change in subject matter. Krentz argues for a certain uniformity between chapters 23 and 24-25, and it is certainly there, but one might adduce as much uniformity between chapter 23 and any of the four remaining discourses.⁵²¹ For these reasons, it is more satisfactory to assume that chapter 23 is not part of the final discourse.

To sum up, it is not possible to say with exactitude where the "Great Discourses" begin. It can be said with somewhat more certainty, however, that of the five discourses, the crowds were among the intended recipients of the Sermon on the Mount, (part of) the parables discourse, and chapter 23, which, however, should not be regarded as a part of the final discourse.⁵²²

8b. *The Portrait of the Crowds in Chapter 13*

There are four explicit mentions of the crowd(s) in the thirteenth Chapter, two at the beginning (13:2 ὄχλοι πολλοί ... πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος // Mk 4:1 ὄχλος πλείστος ... πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος) and two in the middle of the discourse where the change takes place. Jesus' speaking in parables to the crowds (ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις 13:34) is regarded as a fulfilment of Psalm 78:2. After imparting this *Reflexionszitat*, Matthew indicates that Jesus then leaves the crowds and goes into a house (τότε ἀφείς τοὺς ὄχλους ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν).

⁵²¹ This is particularly so with chapter 23 and the Sermon on the Mount. See the striking parallels between Mt 6:1-18 and 23:1-22 brought up by Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 125-27.

⁵²² G. N. Stanton ("The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount" in Hawthorne and Betz *Tradition*, 181-92, 188) finds a "dual" audience (i.e. crowds and disciples) in the same discourses, though he appears to imply that chapter 23 is part of the final discourse.

As such, the four verses neatly encapsulate the part of the discourse directed at the crowds. In addition to these, Kingsbury has argued⁵²³ that there are many more indirect references to the crowds between 13:2 and 13:36 in the form of the pronoun αὐτοῖς (13:3,10,13,24,31,33,34) or on one occasion ἐκείνοις (13:11).⁵²⁴ While this is largely true, Kingsbury overstates his case in claiming that Matthew here "makes of αὐτοῖς a *terminus technicus* designating the Jews".⁵²⁵ At 13:11 αὐτοῖς refers to the disciples while at 13:31-34, as Sanders and Davies remark, the word is just as likely to refer to both the crowds and the disciples.⁵²⁶ Certainly the disciples' demand for an explanation of the Parable of the Tares (13:36) would support such a view. What is important for determining the status of the crowds is how αὐτοῖς is used in relation to Jesus' disciples. This will be taken up further below. Nevertheless, as shall be seen, it is a constituent part of the overriding theme of the parable chapter.

It has long been recognized that chapter 13 develops a major contrast between the crowds and the disciples.⁵²⁷ Dupont and Klauck have rightly observed that Matthew anticipates and prepares for this contrast in the pericope of Jesus' true family (12:46-50) which immediately precedes the parable chapter.⁵²⁸ It is here that the antithesis between the disciples and the crowds is first expressly developed, anticipating the distinctions to come.

Still, this view has not met with universal acceptance. R. H. Gundry, for instance, maintains that "Jesus does not address his words concerning those who do the will of God - i.e., his disciples - to the crowd, but to the individual who has just announced the presence of Jesus' mother and brothers outside. This change derives from Matthew's equating the crowds with disciples: Jesus no longer speaks to the crowds *about* his disciples, but to the anonymous herald about the crowds *as* his

⁵²³ Kingsbury, *Parables* 13, 47.

⁵²⁴ 13:3 // Mk 4:2 αὐτούς; 13:11 // Mk 4:11.

⁵²⁵ Kingsbury, *Parables*, 47.

⁵²⁶ Sanders and Davies, *Studying*, 204.

⁵²⁷ Dupont, "Chapitre", 221.

⁵²⁸ Cf. Dupont, "Chapitre", 239-40; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 244#296. Of course, the distinction between the crowds and disciples is made as early as 5:1.

disciples."⁵²⁹ Gundry's analysis, however, seems excessively idiosyncratic. It ignores the distinctions that pertain throughout the rest of the gospel,⁵³⁰ as well as the changes within this pericope. It is odd, for example, that Matthew would use ἐκτείνω, here meaning "I point at someone",⁵³¹ if he meant Jesus was signifying everyone. Mark's περιβλεπόμενος would surely be a more natural usage. The reason Matthew resorts to ἐκτείνω is that he wants to distinguish the disciples from the crowds.⁵³² He has introduced the disciples at 12:49 and moved the crowds to the beginning of 12:46 so as to create an opposition.⁵³³ At this juncture, the disciples are Jesus' brother, sister and mother because they do the will of his Father in heaven. The Matthean crowds though, unlike the crowds in Mark's Gospel, are not doing his Father's will. As was said above, this does not preclude their coming to do the will of the Father, but merely indicates that they are not yet doing it. Thus, at the very outset of the Parable Chapter, Matthew introduces a major distinction between the two groups.

Matthew follows Mark in having Jesus direct parables at the crowd, but he is described as speaking to them rather than teaching them (13:3 καὶ ἐλάλησαν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς vs. Mk 4:2 καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ κτλ).⁵³⁴ His departure from Mark might be attributed to a more circumscribed view of teaching⁵³⁵ or possibly, to less optimistic expectations about the message's effect.⁵³⁶ Alternately, it may simply stem

⁵²⁹ Gundry, *Matthew*, 249.

⁵³⁰ So Michael J. Wilkins, *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel*, NovTSup LIX (Leiden: Brill, 1988) 139.

⁵³¹ BAG s.v. ἐκτείνω.

⁵³² Gundry's observation about the herald is also curious. Is Jesus' remark aimed solely at the herald?

⁵³³ Matthew omits Mark's "and a crowd was sitting about him" (3:32), perhaps because it was awkward, but in all likelihood, because he wished to present a more exalted picture of Jesus.

⁵³⁴ Kingsbury (*Parables*, 28-30) interprets Matthew's substitution of λαλέω for διδάσκω as a sign of the "turning point" of Jesus away from the "Jews".

⁵³⁵ Following Bornkamm's well known observation that διδάσκειν is related to the exposition of the law, "End Expectation", 38#1.

⁵³⁶ Sanders and Davies remark that "'teaching' has the narrower connotation of enabling someone to learn, whereas 'speaking' may fall on deaf ears, and that is part of the situation to be described in the rest of the chapter.", *Studying*, 209. This perspective would fit well with the use of λαλέω at 23:1 where Jesus' warnings about the Pharisees are directed at both the disciples and the crowds.

from a certain disinclination to style the discourses as 'teaching'.⁵³⁷ In any event, this 'speaking' is directed at them. This is not to say that the disciples are not tacitly included, as 13:10 ff. makes clear, but here the crowds are the main recipients (cf. 13:34).

Specifically, they are the recipients of parables. Matthew emphasizes this fact by having the disciples ask Jesus directly, why he speaks to the crowds in parables (13:10). This question is suggestive, because it might imply, as Jülicher argues, both that the disciples are familiar with the parabolic method of instruction, and that they find it a difficult one.⁵³⁸ Yet the difficulty associated with the method is debated,⁵³⁹ particularly over the question of the disciples' own capacity to understand it.⁵⁴⁰ Is parabolic speech a propaedeutic designed to help the hearer penetrate the mysteries of the Kingdom, or is it enigmatic speech intended to confound the auditor? What can be said for certain, is that Matthew attaches considerable significance to the word παραβολή. Even though the word is not found in the gospel prior to chapter 13, it suddenly occurs eleven times within the compass of the chapter.⁵⁴¹ Such a concatenation of the word warrants a more detailed examination.

8c. Parables

As is well known, παραβολή is derived from παραβάλλω meaning "throw

⁵³⁷ Keegan observes that Matthew uses διδάσκω "at the beginning of the first discourse and never again at any point in any of the discourses." Keegan, "Formulae", 420#26. The same holds true for διδαχή which is found at the end of the first discourse and not in any of the other discourses.

⁵³⁸ A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* 2 Bde. (Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899) II 32. "so eine schwere, vielverlangende Lehrweise". In Mark "those who were about him with the twelve asked him concerning the parables" (Mk 4:10). Most of 13:10 is a reformulation of 13:3, though Matthew's customary προσέρχομαι is in evidence.

⁵³⁹ See Bastiaan Van Elderen, "The Purpose of Parables according to Matthew 13:10-17" in R.N. Longenecker and M.C. Tenney (eds.) *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 180-90, 189, who opines that "for Matthew, parables are not intended to conceal truth from the masses" but to clarify and illustrate. He cites Filson, *St Matthew* 160, who presents a similar view.

⁵⁴⁰ To Kingsbury (*Parables* 48-49), for instance, the disciples comprehend the parables as a matter of course, but for Via ("Matthew on the Understandability of the Parables" *JBL* 84 (1965) 430-32, 432) the disciples have understanding because "they have the special privilege of private explanations".

⁵⁴¹ Though this emphasis is more pronounced in Matthew, with 11 of the 16 instances of the word occurring in the chapter, it is also strongly evident in Mark with 7 of 12 instances of the word present in chapter 4.

beside or by".⁵⁴² This brings out one of its typical meanings in classical Greek of "comparison", "illustration" or "analogy."⁵⁴³ Traditionally, however, παραβολή in the New Testament, because of its diversity of meanings, has been regarded as more akin to the מִשְׁלָּה of the Hebrew Scriptures.⁵⁴⁴ John Sider has contested this insight, and argued that analogy is the decisive component of the synoptic parables; "From all the gospel applications of *parabolē* to particular sayings, it is clear that the center of the field of meaning is still just what it was for Aristotle — *illustration by analogy*."⁵⁴⁵ While at first glance this appears to be a helpful distinction, in practice, it proves to be less so. One reason is that Sider has greatly expanded what is commonly meant by analogy (and indeed what Aristotle apparently meant by it), to the point of distortion. His category of 'classification', for instance, as he acknowledges, typically constitutes the first stage of defining something.⁵⁴⁶ Yet even when he is allowed such a broad understanding of analogy, he has trouble accounting for all the parables in the synoptic tradition, particularly the proverbial ones, such as Lk 4:23 "physician, heal yourself".⁵⁴⁷ Given his rather procrustean treatment, the traditional understanding is to be preferred.

In Matthew, generally speaking, παραβολή refers to narratives.⁵⁴⁸ This

⁵⁴² LSJ s.v. παραβολή.

⁵⁴³ *Ibid.*, This is the sense in which Aristotle uses it in the *Rhetoric* (1393a-b) where it is defined (along with the fable) as being one of the two kinds of παραδείγματα. E. M. Cope in his commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (*The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary* rev. J. E. Sandys, 3 vols. (New York: Arno, (1877)1973), vol. 2, 198) suggests that Aristotle "distinguishes parable in general from fable by this; that the former depicts human relations (in which the New Testament parable coincides with it); it invents analogous cases, which are not historical, but always such as might be so; always probable, and corresponding with what actually occurs in real life. The fable is pure fiction, and its essential characteristic is that it invests beasts, birds, plants, and even things inanimate with the attributes of humanity."

⁵⁴⁴ Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden* II 33ff.; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* Rev. Ed., tr. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM, 1972) 20; John R. Donahue, *Gospel*, 5. For an indication of the breadth of the term מִשְׁלָּה see the overview in Madeline Boucher, *The Mysterious Parable, A Literary Study*. CBQMS 6 (Washington: C.B.A.A., 1977) 87-88.

⁵⁴⁵ John W. Sider, "The Meaning of *Parabolē* in the Usage of the Synoptic Evangelists" *Bib* 62 (1981) 453-70. Curiously, Sider does not discuss (nor even refer to) Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. He suggests that the usage of Matthew and Mark is confined to "analogy of equation describing an event" (470).

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 461, "the tenor can be a particular instance which is illuminated by appeal to the vehicle of a general category or principle... 'The heart is a muscle' or 'The heart is an organ'".

⁵⁴⁷ He has similar problems with some of the מִשְׁלָּה in the LXX, as he himself recognizes (458).

⁵⁴⁸ In what follows I am only concerned with Matthew's use of the word παραβολή since it is the word itself which receives emphasis in chapter 13.

includes all of the parables in Chapter 13, as well as the parables directed against the Pharisees -- those of the Two Sons (21:28-32), the Wicked Husbandmen (21:33-44), and the Marriage Feast (22:1-14).⁵⁴⁹ Apart from these instances, παραβολή also refers to the lesson of the fig tree (24:32 // Mk 13:28) and is used by the disciples of Jesus' utterance about what defiles a man (15:15 // Mk 7:17).⁵⁵⁰

Like Mark, Matthew does not appear to adhere to an entirely consistent viewpoint.⁵⁵¹ On the one hand, he seems to suggest that parabolic interpretation is straightforward, because the chief priests and Pharisees are aware that he is speaking parables against them (ἔγνωσαν ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει 21:45 cf. Mk 12:12). Given the blindness for which the Pharisees are frequently reproached (15:14; 23:16,17,19,24,26), their insight here is all the more noteworthy.

On the other hand, there are frequent indications that parabolic speech is opaque. One demonstrable instance of this is that interpretations are offered for the parables of the Tares (13:36-43), and the Dragnet (13:49-50).⁵⁵² When joined with the interpretation of the parable of the Sower, they suggest that parabolic speech requires interpretation. What is more, when it is recognized that the interpretation of the parable of the Sower is confined to the disciples, it emerges that all the interpretations are reserved exclusively for the disciples.⁵⁵³ Nor is it particularly surprising that the two longest parables in the chapter - the Sower and the Tares - are interpreted for the disciples.

⁵⁴⁹ Cf. 13:34,53; 21:33; 22:1. If 13:52 is a parable, then it is not a narrative parable.

⁵⁵⁰ Matthew and Luke both omit Mk 3:23, presumably in favour of the Q version.

⁵⁵¹ Kingsbury (*Parables* 135) suggests that Matthew has incorporated a double tradition about the nature of parabolic speech into his gospel. While this may be true, Sanders and Davies, *Studying* 210-11 rightly note that there are different degrees of understanding involved on the parts of the hearers. This appears to be Bornkamm's view as well, "The parables mediate a certain general understanding of the nature of the Kingdom of God without disclosing its mystery", ("μυστήριον κτλ" *TDNT* 4 802-28,818).

⁵⁵² Jeremias (*Parables*, 85, 81-85) has effectively demonstrated that the interpretations are "the work of Matthew himself". It should also be borne in mind that Matthew follows Mark in having Jesus expound the parable (μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν) of the fig tree to the disciples (24:32-36 // Mk 13:28-32).

⁵⁵³ This is probably the reason for the awkward construction of the chapter, where the Tares parable is in the "crowds" half of the discourse, and the interpretation in the "disciples" half. The Tares parable has been placed in the first half of the discourse either because it is linked thematically with the Sower parable, or it is designed to replace Mark's Seed Growing Secretly parable (Mk 4:26-29) which Matthew has omitted.

This is all the more firmly brought out by the fact that the disciples demand interpretation. When the disciples and Jesus have left the crowds they approach Jesus and ask him to explain the parable of the weeds of the field (13:36). The word used by the disciples διασαφέω ("make clear")⁵⁵⁴ is likely Matthean, since, apart from 18:31, it is a *hapax legomenon*. Similarly, when the disciples ask Jesus about "what proceeds from the man defiling the man", Matthew has the disciples phrase the question differently than they do in Mark. In the latter, they "asked him (ἐπερωτάω) about the parable" (Mk 7:17). In the first gospel, it becomes "Explain (φράζω)⁵⁵⁵ the parable to us.", (15:15). Certainly, the disciples are reproached for not understanding at this juncture, but presumably, the reason underlying the interpretations is to help facilitate their understanding. This would appear to be the import of Matthew 13:52 as well, not that the disciples have always understood, but that they come to understand after Jesus' interpretations, and will perhaps, come to a point where, ultimately, they no longer require interpretation. Nevertheless, the strong impression which emerges from the foregoing is that parabolic speech is obscure. The disciples demand, and are given, interpretations to some of the parables. If, in fact, parables were to be regarded as straightforward illustrations, it is difficult to see why the disciples would require further interpretation, or why, for that matter, Matthew would place so much emphasis on the need for interpretation.⁵⁵⁶

8d. *Matthew 13:10-23* ⁵⁵⁷

Klauck observes with justice that "Der Gegensatz zwischen Jüngern und Volk

⁵⁵⁴ BAG s.v. διασαφέω.

⁵⁵⁵ BAG s.v. φράζω also suggests "interpret something mysterious". The Textus Receptus has φράζω at 13:36.

⁵⁵⁶ This is integral to Matthew's recasting of Mark's obtuse disciples into disciples who understand (See Barth, *TIM* 105-112). As the understanding of parables is one component of this recasting, it would surely be damning the disciples with faint praise to insist that they understood things that were perfectly straightforward. It is only when the parables are regarded as abstruse, that this emphasis of Matthew's makes sense.

⁵⁵⁷ The examination which follows is primarily concerned with the crowds and how they are situated in relation to the disciples. For a discussion of Matthew's redaction see Allen, *St. Matthew*, 144-47; Wilkens, "Redaktion", 307-14.

ist bestimmend für das Verständnis von Mt 13,10-18".⁵⁵⁸ This contrast can be detected both in the form of the passage as well as its content. Formally, it can be seen in the use of contrasting pronouns. After the distinction between the crowds and the disciples is established at 13:10 it is accentuated by the emphatic ὑμῖν and ἐκείνοις of 13:11. These pronouns are then taken up by the parallel use of ὅστις in 13:12.⁵⁵⁹ In the succeeding two verses, the crowds are twice referred to as αὐτοῖς and are, in turn, contrasted with the emphatic ὑμῶν and ὑμεῖς used of the disciples at 13:16 and 13:18. The overall effect is to sharply differentiate the two.

The same holds true for the way in which the sentences are framed. In both 13:11 and 13:12, Matthew uses antithetic parallelism to highlight the differences between the two groups. The effect of the twice-repeated δέδοται is to create a sharp disjunction between the two - "To you it has been given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it has not been given",⁵⁶⁰ an effect which is further intensified by 13:12.⁵⁶¹ A broader form of parallelism is elaborated over the next six verses, with three devoted to the crowds (13:13-15), and three to the disciples (13:16-18).⁵⁶² By means of frequently repeated keywords like "see", "hear", and "understand", Matthew makes the contrast even more pointed. The recurring causal ὅτι used of the crowds at 13:13 and twice of the disciples at 13:16 is particularly

⁵⁵⁸ Klauck, *Allegorie* 244; cf. Burnett, *Testament*, 106; Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 93.

⁵⁵⁹ Trilling, *Wahre*, 77.

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 98.

⁵⁶¹ Charles E. Carlston, *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 6. Part of this intensification resides in the fact that the parallelism in verse 12 is complete, whereas in verse 11, the second γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια is implied.

⁵⁶² The *Reflexionszitat* at 13:14-15 is often regarded as a later interpolation. In this regard see Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 103-105; *idem*, *Matthäusevangelium I*, 477-78; S. E. Johnson, "The Biblical Quotations in Matthew", *HTR* 36 (1943) 135-53, 137-38; Kingsbury, *Parables*, 38-39; McConnell, *Law*, 142-43; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungsitate*, 23-24; Stendahl, *School*, 130-32; Strecker, *Weg*, 70#3. This view has not gone uncontested. Advocates of the passage's authenticity include Gundry, *Use*, 116-18; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 112; Trilling, *Wahre*, 78#18; Van Segbroeck, "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents" in Didier, *L'Évangile*, 107-30, 126-27 and *idem*, "Le scandale de l'incroyance: la signification de Mt., xiii, 35" *ETL* 41 (1965), 344-72, 349-52. Although the passage's correspondence with Acts 28:26-27 is striking, so is its virtually unanimous manuscript support. The uncharacteristic introduction of 13:14 is as at least as much in favour of the authenticity of the formula quotation as against it, since a later glossator would be far more likely to follow the pattern already established by Matthew. And since the anomalies of the passage can otherwise be explained by reference to chapter 13 itself, it seems best to assume that 13:14-15 is not an interpolation.

effective in this regard.⁵⁶³ Taken together, the formal features of this passage demonstrate a carefully developed opposition between the two groups.

This contrast extends to the content of the passage. The most momentous distinction is the one made by Jesus at 13:11, "To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it has not been given." The use of the divine passive here, is worthy of remark, because it indicates at the very outset of the discussion that the distinction between the two groups is, ultimately, one which derives from God.⁵⁶⁴ This distinction is made manifest through revelation.⁵⁶⁵ The disciples are the recipients of the divine mysteries, while the crowds are not.

The nature of these μυστήρια is debated.⁵⁶⁶ Hill is probably right, however, when he sees in the secrets "the purpose of God concerning his kingdom - that it is inaugurated in the person, words and work of Jesus of Nazareth",⁵⁶⁷ though the eschatological aspects of the kingdom ought not to be ignored.⁵⁶⁸ The disciples, therefore, have been imparted insights about the kingdom - particularly its advent in Jesus - that have been withheld from the crowds.

Verse 12 functions largely as a codicil to verse 11, as is made evident through his addition of γάρ.⁵⁶⁹ Klauck rightly notes that this passage relates the activity of God

⁵⁶³ Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 93.

⁵⁶⁴ On the divine passive cf. Jeremias, *Parables*, 15. Ogawa (*L'histoire* 219) remarks that "il s'agit de l'économie divine". See Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 98, for the signification of the perfect passive.

⁵⁶⁵ For a discussion of the themes of revelation and concealment and their relationship with 11:25ff. see C. Deutsch, *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke. Wisdom, Torah, and Discipleship in Matthew 11.25-30* JSNTSS 18 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1987) 23-32. She rightly regards the νήπιοι of 11:25 as a designation for the disciples (34), which means 11:25ff. anticipates 13:10-17, and both of these passages anticipate Peter's confession and Jesus' rejoinder at 16:16ff..

⁵⁶⁶ Kingsbury, (*Parables*, 46) argues that they embrace the "whole of ethics and eschatology" while Bornkamm ("μυστήριον", 819), sees Jesus the Messiah as the mystery. Otto Betz suggests that in the NT, μυστήριον signifies "eine apokalyptische Weisheit, die mit der Prophetie verbunden und auf geschichtliche Vorgänge bezogen ist." (*Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960) 87). None of these views is entirely satisfactory. *Pace* Kingsbury, it is better to say that the secrets serve as the grounding for ethical behaviour, but do not themselves comprise it. Bornkamm's view appears to be based solely on Mark, while that of Betz is, perhaps, overly influenced by the Qumran materials.

⁵⁶⁷ Hill, *Matthew*, 226. Cp. R. E. Brown, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament MYSTERION" *Bib* 39 (1958) 426-48, 430.

⁵⁶⁸ Cope, (*Scribe*, 17), in arguing that "knowledge of the secrets is knowledge of impending judgement", underestimates the christological component of the kingdom.

⁵⁶⁹ Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 102; Trilling, *Wahre*, 77. For the well known rabbinic parallel to this passage see *SB* I 661.

to the disposition of the hearer.⁵⁷⁰ It is possible that Matthew is applying this remark specifically to the disciples' predisposition to approach Jesus for further instruction - particularly interpretations of the parables.⁵⁷¹ In this case, the disciples would "have" in the sense that they are able to hear what Jesus relates to them (13:16,18), and to understand enough to know when to approach him for further instruction.⁵⁷² The crowds, by contrast, lack this basic predisposition, and the opacity of the parables exacerbates their situation.⁵⁷³

Verse 13 continues this line of thought, but is framed in such a way as to offer a direct response to the disciples' query at 13:10 - "This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand". Matthew's substitution of ὅτι for Mark's ἵνα is sometimes thought to be a softening of Mark's portrayal,⁵⁷⁴ since Jesus no longer speaks to the crowds so that they will not understand, but because they are already without understanding. Yet it does not soften the portrayal of the crowds. Their obduracy is emphasized by Matthew in his denying them any perception whatsoever. Unlike "those outside" in Mark, the crowds in Matthew do not see or hear at all.⁵⁷⁵ Their hardened character is further emphasized by the inclusion of the citation from Isaiah 6:9-10, which gives a renewed emphasis to 13:13.⁵⁷⁶ The use of the *hapax legomenon* ἀναπληροῦν, indicates, as Gundry has suggested, that the quotation "now receives a full measure of

⁵⁷⁰ Klauck, *Allegorie*, 248.

⁵⁷¹ Cf. 13:10; 13:36; 15:15. On προσέρχομαι see Thompson, *Divided*, 51-2 and James R. Edwards, "The Use of ΠΡΟΣΕΡΧΕΣΘΑΙ in the Gospel of Matthew", *JBL* 106 (1987) 65-74, 67. Edwards notes that in about three fourths of Matthew's 52 uses of the word, it is Jesus who is approached, and that it is the disciples who most frequently approach him to ask him questions. Edwards lists 8:25; 13:10, 36; 14:15; 15:12, 23; 17:19; 18:1, 21; 24:1, 3; 26:17.

⁵⁷² Via (*Self-Deception* 117-21) follows a similar line, but fails to appreciate that the disciples' understanding is primarily of Jesus (cf. 11:27 with 11:25). As is made clear by 16:17f., the disciples are indeed given by God more understanding of who Jesus is. This insight is followed by still more secrets about the kingdom, such as John the Baptist's identification with Elijah (17:13).

⁵⁷³ Kretzer (*Herrschaft*, 102) sees an intriguing *heilsgeschichtlich* stamp to this passage: "Die Futura δοθήσεται, ἀρθήσεται weisen vielmehr hin auf 21,43: ὅτι ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία...καὶ δοθήσεται.". See too, Van Elderen, "Purpose", 187.

⁵⁷⁴ BDF 369:(2); Carlston, *Triple*, 7.

⁵⁷⁵ Compare Mark's account: "so that they may indeed see but not perceive, and may indeed hear but not understand (4:12)". Gnlika (*Verstockung*, 93) notes that Matthew's reformulation "besagt nicht ein halbes, unvollkommenes Erkennen, sondern sie streitet jede Erkenntnis ab".

⁵⁷⁶ Trilling, *Wahre*, 78.

fulfilment".⁵⁷⁷ The predicted hardening now fills up its full measure in the crowds.

By contrast, the macarism of 13:16 is intended as an antithesis to the Isaiah citation. The disciples' eyes and ears are pronounced blessed, precisely because (ὅτι) they see and hear. Unlike the crowds, they see and hear the long-awaited time of salvation in Jesus.⁵⁷⁸ This insight is further developed by 13:17. As Gnika recognizes, the verse is clearly alluding to the messianic deeds of Jesus described at 11:5.⁵⁷⁹ The disciples in hearing and seeing the inbreaking of the messianic age⁵⁸⁰ are privileged to see what many prophets and righteous men wanted to, but could not. This implicitly condemns the crowds even further. If they were present, the prophets and righteous men, like the disciples, would have recognized Jesus and the dawn of the messianic age. Yet the crowds, who are present, grossly fail to perceive or understand what would have been so obvious and so welcome to their venerated forbears.

Taken as a whole, therefore, Matthew 13:10-17 is designed to create a sharp disjunction between the crowds and the disciples. Both in terms of form and content, the passage develops an unrelieved and explicit antithesis between the crowds and Jesus' disciples.

8e. *Matthew 13:18-23*

The antithesis between the crowds and disciples continues in Matthew's interpretation of the Parable of the Sower. It is most obvious in his inclusion of the word συνήμι which occurs twice in the interpretation.⁵⁸¹ It is first mentioned at 13:19 in the explanation of the seeds sown on the path: "When anyone hears the word of the kingdom and does not understand it, the evil one comes and snatches away what was sown in his heart". The second occurrence of the word is found in the interpretation of

⁵⁷⁷ Gundry, *Use*, 117. For a more detailed discussion of how this citation meshes with Matthew's theological intentions, see Van Segbroeck, "Scandale", 349-52.

⁵⁷⁸ Michaelis, "ὁπάω" *TDNT* V 315-82, 347.

⁵⁷⁹ Gnika, *Matthäusevangelium* I 484.

⁵⁸⁰ Klaus Berger, (*Die Amen-Worte Jesu* BZNW 39 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970) 86) points out that 13:17 reflects a Jewish tradition about the blessedness of those who live in the messianic age. Cf. Ψ Sal 17:44; 18:6.

⁵⁸¹ συνήμι is not found in Mark's or Luke's version. Given its prominence in Matthew (Mt 9 Mk 5 Lk 4) its presence here is best taken as redactional.

the seed sown on good soil: "this is he who hears the word and understands it; he indeed bears fruit...". The recurrence of συνίημι (and ἀκούω) in such a context just after 13:10-17 can hardly be fortuitous. Matthew has deliberately altered the parable's interpretation to make it correspond to the descriptions of the crowds and disciples he has elaborated in 13:10-17. In verses 13 and 14, it is twice related that the crowds hear but do not understand. Moreover, 13:12 states that what the crowds have will be taken away from them, a circumstance which corresponds to the interpretation, where the devil comes and snatches away what was sown in the heart. This correspondence also applies to the disciples. It is twice stated in 13:16-17 that the disciples hear,⁵⁸² while the conclusion of the parable chapter (13:51) asserts that the disciples understand all these things (i.e. the parables of the Kingdom 13:24,31,33,44,45,47 cp. 13:19 word of the kingdom). The correlation is obvious.

This correlation becomes even more obvious when it is recognized that in the interpretation, each of the hearers "hears" the word (13:19,20,22,23), but it is only the first and the last hearers who are described as either understanding or failing to understand. Such a state of affairs fits readily with the antithetical depiction of the crowds and disciples which emerges from 13:10-17.

If this correlation is true, however, it casts the crowds in a very poor light indeed. The interpretation indicates, that in Matthew's view, the crowds are like those sown on the path. They hear the word but do not understand it, and as a result, eventually lose it. Unlike the seed of the rocky soil and the thorns, the seed on the path does not even germinate. The crowds, like a hardened path, are impervious to the message of the kingdom, and never respond at all. What the interpretation adds to 13:10-17, is the note of finality. What was intimated at 13:12 becomes explicit here. The crowds never do respond to the message, and the chance to respond is ultimately withdrawn from them. The interpretation, therefore, simply makes more explicit what was already expressed in 13:10-17. The crowds are devoid of understanding, and

⁵⁸² Cf. Jesus' emphatic introduction to the interpretation Ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολήν (no//s).

what is more, they will remain so.⁵⁸³

Taken as a whole, therefore, 13:10-23 presents an unrelievedly pessimistic view of the crowds. They are deliberately contrasted with the disciples in such a way as to make their deficiencies and obduracy obvious, and Matthew intimates this posture is not likely to change. This naturally poses serious problems for interpreting the crowds. How is it that Matthew is so stridently negative toward the crowds at 13:10-23, and yet, generally well disposed toward them elsewhere in the gospel? The most effective solution to this problem is to recognize that the focus of the parable chapter, is not on the "historical" level of the gospel, but the transparent level. Klauck is surely correct when he argues:

Diese Einschätzung der Menge mag zunächst überraschen, da Matthäus sonst in den Rahmenbemerkungen von Markus eine Reihe positiver Aussagen über die Menge übernimmt. Doch wird bei Matthäus die Ebene der historischen Darstellung hier transzendiert. Der Gegensatz von einsichtigen Jüngern und uneinsichtigem Volk zielt auf das Verhältnis von Kirche und Synagoge.⁵⁸⁴

There are several reasons for adopting this view. The first, as Zumstein argues, is that the distinction between the disciples and crowds is so sharp that it requires a later situation in the life of the church (post 70) to be explicable.⁵⁸⁵ This view is further confirmed by the fact that the interpretation of the parable of the sower presents an unequivocal judgement on the final status of the crowds. The very fact that such a judgement could be ventured suggests a measure of distance on the part of Matthew and his community. The crowds have had the word, but failed, ultimately, to respond to it.

Conclusion

⁵⁸³ In my view, the parables which follow are not (*pace* Kingsbury *Parables*, 63-91) explicitly concerned with the crowds. They are linked thematically by growth, and it is for this reason they follow the parable of the sower.

⁵⁸⁴ Klauck, *Allegorie*, 249.

⁵⁸⁵ Zumstein, *Condition*, 185#74.

To sum up, the discussion of the five discourses, concluded that the crowds were among the intended recipients of the Sermon on the Mount, (part of) the parables discourse, and chapter 23, though this chapter is not part of the final discourse. The discussion of the first part of the chapter revealed that there is a distinction made between the disciples and crowds which begins at 12:46-50, and which is also seen in the fact that interpretations to some parables are given to the disciples but not the crowds. This dichotomy becomes more pronounced in 13:10-17, which is designed, both in terms of form and content, to distinguish the disciples from the crowds. While the disciples perceive and understand, the crowds are devoid of both these capabilities, a view which is reiterated in Matthew's version of the sower parable's interpretation. Such a pessimistic portrayal of the crowds does not fit with the tenor of Matthew's historical level, and is, therefore, best regarded as a passage more suited to the transparent level of the gospel.

9. THE CROWDS' REJECTION OF JESUS

The crowds' rejection of Jesus is one of the more jarring features of the gospel, especially in light of their earlier favourable response to him. To consider this in more detail, the following discussion will examine the crowds' "change of heart" and then examine their particular role in the trial narrative.

9a. *The Volte-Face of the Crowds*

For those who argue that the portrayal of the crowds in Matthew is uniformly favourable, the part played by the ὄχλοι in the passion account is problematic. Minear, for instance, attempts to posit a different crowd—a non-Galilean crowd sent by the chief priests and elders of the people.⁵⁸⁶ This is difficult. Are the crowds mentioned at 22:33 (καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ), who are described as listening to Jesus in the temple,⁵⁸⁷ to be construed as Galileans as well?

⁵⁸⁶ Minear, "Crowds", 35 and *idem*, *Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1982) 131.

⁵⁸⁷ It is presupposed from 21:23 to 24:1 that Jesus is in the temple. Verse 21:26 also

What is the basis of Minear's distinction? Matthew offers none. Instead, even if Matthew does not make the connexion explicit, it would seem better to see in these crowds, the crowds at 26:55: "Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs to capture me? Day after day I sat in the temple teaching and you did not seize me" (55b καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐκαθεζόμεν διδάσκων καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με). The correlation between the crowds and the teaching in the temple is obvious, and the latent irony is deepened thereby - at that time they were too busy marvelling to seize him.⁵⁸⁸

This correlation is also supported by Matthew's indifferent use of the plural and singular to characterize the crowds that come to arrest Jesus (26:47 ὄχλος πολλὸς // Mk 14:43 ὄχλος; 26:55 τοῖς ὄχλοις no//). On the one occasion where Matthew depicts a separate crowd, he uses the singular in both instances, emphasizing thereby the singular character of the group.⁵⁸⁹ One would expect that if Matthew were intent on distinguishing this one group from the crowds as a whole he would have followed this distinction, or at least introduced another. It is this very lack of distinction therefore, that suggests the crowds as a whole are being referred to.⁵⁹⁰

If the above argument is true, what reasons does Matthew offer for this change? Matthew does offer one efficient cause in the form of the high priests and elders of the people (26:47 cf. Mk 14:43). Given the role they assume in the passion narrative (cf. 27:20) it is not difficult to see the crowds being swayed by them. More important for Matthew is the framework which underlies this particular event—something which he

presupposes an audience composed of the crowds—otherwise the leaders would not have been afraid to reply to Jesus concerning John's baptism.

⁵⁸⁸ Matthew's addition of ἐκαθεζόμεν would support this interpretation since it emphasizes the authority—the ἐξουσία—with which he spoke (Cp. 22:33 with 7:28, 29 and 5:1 καθίσαντος).

⁵⁸⁹ Both 9:23 and 9:25 are without parallel.

⁵⁹⁰ Minear's argument seems largely to function from the premise that because the crowd changes its behaviour it must be a different crowd. The very fact however that this crowd is coupled with Judas at 26:47 (Ἰούδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολλὸς κτλ) suggests the wrongness of this assumption. Are we to postulate a different Judas on the *a priori* assumption that one of Jesus' disciples would never betray him? The coupling of the crowds with Judas therefore, is an apt one.

Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 159, appears to follow Minear's line of argumentation when he claims that "it is not permissible to harmonize the ὄχλοι mentioned in Mt 9,33,12:23; 21:9 with the ὄχλοι of Mt 27,20 and then continue to assume a certain development . . .". This does not seem entirely true. Why should development necessarily be inconsistent with a change of heart?

develops at 26:56—τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν.⁵⁹¹

The most significant feature of this verse is Matthew's addition of τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν to Mark's citation. He uses it distinctively here in making ὅλον refer to an event.⁵⁹² Judging from his use of a similar expression at 1:22 (where 1:22, 23 refer to the circumstances preceding Jesus' birth of 1:18ff.) ὅλον here refers to the arrest of Jesus.⁵⁹³ Yet it also has a broader purview encompassing the entire passion account, of which the arrest is just the beginning.⁵⁹⁴ Senior expresses this well: "in the act of betrayal and the deliverance into the hands of sinners the entire Passion is defined".⁵⁹⁵

Both the immediate and the broader application of the phrase have a bearing on the crowds as such. Matthew's treatment of them here and in the later passion account make it abundantly clear that their actions are to be seen as the fulfillment of scripture.⁵⁹⁶ This is most clearly seen in the temporal indications that Matthew has taken over from Mark and expanded. Like Mark he refers to Jesus' hour "being at hand" (ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα 26:45 // Mk 14:41) but goes on to add "in that hour" (Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ⁵⁹⁷ 26:55) precisely at the moment when Jesus addresses the crowds.

⁵⁹¹ The passage is best taken as Matthew's recasting of Mark 14:49 (see Schulz, *Stunde*, 170, Senior, *Passion*, 142-148; Alfred Suhl, *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Auspielungen im Markusevangelium* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965) 42, though it is not of fundamental significance either way; 26:56 can be taken as a final remark by Jesus, or an editorial remark by Matthew. Of these two possibilities, the latter is more probable; "dies ist eine deutliche Reflexion des Erzählers im Stile der übrigen Reflexionszitate (Suhl, *Funktion*, 42; see too, Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 134; Prabhu, *Formula*, 30; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 34-35; Senior, *Passion*, 152; and for further material #3,154). On the relation of 26:56 to the *Reflexionszitate* see: Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 134; Nepper-Christensen, *Matthäusevangelium*, 139-142; Prabhu, *Formula*, 26-31; Strecker, *Weg*, 49 #2. For the purposes of this discussion it is immaterial whether 26:56 is formally regarded as one of the *Reflexionszitate* or not, since in function, if not in form, it is closely allied to them.

⁵⁹² For this distinctive usage see Prabhu, *Formula*, 28; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 35.

⁵⁹³ Cf. a similar usage of τοῦτο at 21:4 which refers back to the events of 21:1ff..

⁵⁹⁴ See Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 134; Schulz, *Stunde*, 170.

⁵⁹⁵ Senior, *Passion*, 154. This can also be inferred from the relative scarcity of *Reflexionszitate* in the actual passion account (cf. Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 176) which effectively places more emphasis on this passage and its relation to the passion.

⁵⁹⁶ It goes without saying that the role of the ὄχλοι is but one strand of the nexus to which ὅλον refers.

⁵⁹⁷ In Matthew, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ is only used once as a temporal transition phrase and that at 18:1 with no previous reference to ὥρα. Otherwise, it occurs most frequently in healing accounts (8:13; 9:22; 15:28; 17:18) to indicate that the healing took place right away. At 10:19 "in that hour" refers back to 10:18 and the moment when the disciples will be dragged before governors and kings to give testimony.

The effect is to provide an implicit answer to the question with which Jesus confronts the crowds. Why is it that they did not seize Jesus in the Temple? It is because the *καιρός*, the fore-ordained hour had not yet arrived. Now, however, with Judas' arrival, the hour has also arrived,⁵⁹⁸ and in full accordance with the scriptures Jesus is seized by the crowds and "betrayed into the hand of sinners".

This might suggest a ready schema whereby the contradictory behaviour of the crowds can be explained. The distinction between the crowds in the temple and the crowds in the garden is not in the crowds themselves, but rather in the time frame. Up until the arrival of the crowds in the garden, Jesus' moment had not yet come—when they did arrive, it had.⁵⁹⁹

Thus, in the first gospel, it is God's fore-ordained economy that ultimately explains the disposition of the crowds. Both their receptivity to Jesus, and their later repudiation of him become understandable within the context of God's divine plan. Both simply reflect God's timing and God's purposes. Matthew indicates that Jesus is well aware of this, which is why at 26:54 he rebukes the disciples for using swords. The moment had arrived, the time for the scriptures to be fulfilled, and Jesus would have nothing interfere with their fulfillment. God's plan as reflected in αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν must transpire in God's time. In Matthew's gospel it does, and under the influence of the Jewish leaders the crowds join with Judas and arrest Jesus.

9b. *The Crowd in the Barabbas Episode (27:15-26)*

Apart from their role in Jesus' arrest, the crowds come to the fore in the Barabbas pericope (27:15-26). There is a general measure of agreement among exegetes⁶⁰⁰ that this passage consists of Matthew's reworking of Mark's account with

⁵⁹⁸ Note Matthew's parallel placement of ἐγγίζω with Judas (26:46) and with ὥρα (26:45) which posits a conjunction between the two. When one has arrived so has the other.

⁵⁹⁹ 26:55 functions almost as a miniature account of the crowd's behaviour.

⁶⁰⁰ Among those who do not agree with such an analysis are Lagrange, *Saint Matthieu*, Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, and X. Leon Dufour, "Mt et Mc dans le Récit de la Passion" *Bib* 40 (1959) 684-696 and *idem*, "Passion" (Récits de la) in *Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément VI* (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1960) cols. 1419-1492. Leon-Dufour attempts to argue for a common "récit plus ancien" (1453) behind Matthew and Mark, but this needlessly multiplies hypotheses. See Senior's critique in "The Passion Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew" in Didier, *L'Évangile*, 343-357, 353, #36. By contrast, Dahl's careful study (Nils Dahl, "The Passion Narrative in Matthew" in Stanton,

the possible addition of traditional material.⁶⁰¹

From the outset it is apparent that Matthew has made some broad changes to the account in Mark. For one, in a variety of ways, he has stressed the crowds' capacity to choose. There is no doubt that the element of choice also figures in Mark's narrative, but Matthew makes the question of choice explicit,⁶⁰² and he continues to dwell on it. At 27:15 for instance, Matthew changes Mark's αὐτοῖς (15:6) to ὄχλῳ⁶⁰³ and then replaces παρητοῦντο (15:6) by ἠθέλον, stressing thereby the crowd's capacity to choose.⁶⁰⁴ Verse 17 follows Mark (15:9) in its use of θέλω except that Matthew makes this a choice between Jesus and Barabbas rather than simply a choice to release Jesus. Where Mark has only θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Matthew has τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν . . . βαρὰββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν. The question has been reformulated into a clear "either/or" decision.⁶⁰⁵ This choice underlies 27:20 and again in 21 Pilate specifically asks τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν. This question, without parallel in Mark, stresses yet again the two alternatives given the crowds. As Gundry observes, Matthew "never seems to tire of reiterating the choice

Interpretation, 42-55, 42-43) shows how Matthew's passion account, while having Mark as its sole written source, could also have been influenced by the oral traditions of Matthew's church environment. On the redaction of the Passion Narrative as whole see A. Descamps, "Rédaction et Christologie dans la Récit matthéen de la Passion" in Didier, (*L'Évangile*, 359-415, 359-360); Dahl, "Passion" 42; Senior, *Passion*, 5-7.

⁶⁰¹ On 27:15-26 see Dahl, "Passion", 49; Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 46. Trilling, *Wahre*, 66, observes that "innerhalb des Passionsberichtes hat Matthäus an dem Stück 27,15-26 stärker gearbeitet als an den anderen". This evaluation ought, however, to be tempered in part by Senior's observation (*Passion*, 235 #1) that Trilling has overemphasized the uniqueness of the passage by viewing it outside the context of the Passion Narrative as a whole.

Verses 27:19 and 24:25 are often held to be traditional or legendary materials, and will be discussed more fully below.

⁶⁰² For this general observation see: S.G.F. Brandon, *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth* (London: Batsford, 1968) 145; F.W. Burnett, *Testament*, 407; Dahl, "Passion", 49; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 205-206; McNeile, *St. Matthew*, 411; C.G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. II, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1927) 346.

⁶⁰³ Probably, as Senior suggests (*Passion*, 236), in dependence on Mk 15:8. See too Weiss, *Matthäus-Evangelium*, 479.

⁶⁰⁴ Gundry, *Matthew*, 560; Trilling, *Wahre*, 73; Weiss, *Matthäus-Evangelium*, 479. Senior, (*Passion*, 236) remarks that "the tonality between the two words is decidedly different. In a sense 'to choose' (θέλω) is prior to and determinative of what one 'demands' or 'requests' (αἰτέω) . . . the verb θέλω is more subjective and 'decisional'—it refers to a person's choice or desire. The verb αἰτέω is used as the expression of that choice."

⁶⁰⁵ Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 47. As part of this *Entweder-Oder* Matthew has also remodelled Mark's framework so that Jesus and Barabbas are not discussed alternately, but rather, as a pair. See Senior, *Passion*, 241.

between Barabbas and Jesus".⁶⁰⁶ And when the crowds finally do decide, they choose Barabbas.⁶⁰⁷

A second feature of the passion account is that Matthew has reduced the turbulence of the scene. Mark's ἀνέσεισαν is changed to ἔπεισαν (15:11 // 27:20) and πάλιν ἔκραξαν to λέγουσιν (15:13 // 27:22),⁶⁰⁸ while the exchange between the crowds and Pilate at 21-232 is made orderly and reasonable.⁶⁰⁹ On these changes Trilling remarks "Matthäus zeichnet nicht eine tumultarische Volksszene . . . sondern einen fast nüchternen, klaren, doch gerade deshalb erschreckend kalten, fast gesetzmäßig verlaufenden Vorgang. Zwischen Pilatus und dem Volk findet weniger ein dramatisches Ringen um Freigabe und Verurteilung, als ein trockenes Zwiegespräch statt".⁶¹⁰ This certainly overstates the case and does not really allow for the turbulence at 23b and 24.⁶¹¹ Still, it is worth observing that the clamour only breaks out when it appears that the crowds might not get their way.⁶¹² Until this point, however, a sober and unemotional tone prevails.

This tone is very much in evidence at 27:20. Here, as noted above, Matthew relates that the chief priests and elders "persuaded" the crowds (instead of Mark's "stirred them up"). It may possibly result from Matthew's desire to simplify Mark's rather rare ἀνέσεισαν,⁶¹³ but given the above mentioned *Tendenz*, it would seem

⁶⁰⁶ Gundry, *Matthew*, 563; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904) 137.

⁶⁰⁷ Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 47. Significantly, Matthew has changed the crowd's request into direct discourse.

⁶⁰⁸ Senior, *Passion*, 240 also mentions "Mark's threatening καὶ ἀναβάς, ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι κτλ (Mk 15:8a)" which Matthew replaces by συνηγμένων . . . αὐτῶν (27:17), but the "threatening" character of Mark's phrase is, at best, ambiguous.

⁶⁰⁹ Cf. Matthew's inclusion of εἶπαν at 27:2121. See as well Lohmeyer, *Matthäus, ad loc* on 27:21-23 and Trilling, *Wahre*, 73.

⁶¹⁰ Trilling, *Wahre*, 74.

⁶¹¹ Trilling, *Wahre*, 73 does, however, recognize these details.

⁶¹² It is particularly ironic that the only time a θόρυβος appears likely to break out amongst the crowd is when Pilate is disinclined to kill Jesus, rather than the reverse (26:5).

⁶¹³ Lagrange, *Saint Matthieu*, 522 and Senior, *Passion*, 248 #2. Strangely, Senior seems to miss the distinction between πείθω and ἀνασείω. He claims that "πείθω is a much more common word for 'invite' or 'persuade'" (248). πείθω is, however, by no means a "more common word for 'invite'"—see Bauer, *Wörterbuch* and *LSJ*. Because of this, Senior has disregarded the differences in this verse.

It is also worth noting that Luke has not hesitated to use ἀνασείω to describe Jesus' presumed effect on the people (Lk 23:5 ἀνασείει τὸν λαὸν . . .).

justifiable to regard it as a theologically motivated alteration.⁶¹⁴ What then is the implication of this change? Gundry argues that the substitution "lightens the crowd's burden of guilt by making them the victims of evil persuasion".⁶¹⁵ Yet this does not really convince. There is no doubt that the chief priests and elders are guilty of misleading the crowds, but this still does not exculpate the crowds.⁶¹⁶ Persuasion implies a reasoned or deliberative process, while "stirred up", by contrast, suggests an unreasoned passionate reaction. Surely a "crime of passion" is less culpable than one that is, in some degree, premeditated. For this reason, the crowds in Matthew bear more responsibility than they would in Mark's version.

Their responsibility is also greater because, in Matthew, the nature of what they acquiesce to is far graver than in Mark. Instead of being stirred up ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν βαρᾶββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς as Mark has it (15:11), Matthew's crowds are persuaded "to ask for Barabbas and destroy Jesus". This is no inconsiderable difference. What persuasion would have been sufficient to induce them to destroy him?

In addition to the above features, Matthew has added various other touches which stress the responsibility of the crowd. The historic present is found at 22b, λέγουσιν πάντες σταυρωθήτω thus giving emphasis to their remark.⁶¹⁷ The inclusion of "all" brings out the complicity of the entire crowd here,⁶¹⁸ while the passive "Let him be crucified" can be taken as an effort to lighten Pilate's guilt and place it on the crowds instead.⁶¹⁹ The shift back to the imperfect ἔκραζον in 23 (vs.

⁶¹⁴ This takes Dahl's caution into consideration. He warns against overinterpretation and states that "not all derivations from Mark are determined by a theological tendency", Dahl, "Passion", 48.

⁶¹⁵ Gundry, *Matthew*, 562, and see Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 221 and n. 128.

⁶¹⁶ As Hill, *Matthew*, 351 would argue. See Burnett, *Testimony*, 407-408, as well.

⁶¹⁷ "Matthew reserves the historical present of λέγω for sayings he wants to emphasize" Gundry, *Matthew*, 563. See also Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 94. Mark has the aorist ἔκραξεν (15:13).

⁶¹⁸ Senior relates that "Matthew takes pains to note that the choice of Barabbas over Jesus has been ratified by all the people" (*Passion*, 251). Cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 563 and Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 333.

⁶¹⁹ See Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, 435; Gundry, *Matthew*, 564; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 445 #115; Strecker, *Weg*, 116; Trilling, *Wahre*, 74 (who sees in it only the exculpation of Pilate). Against this view Albright and Mann, *Matthew*, 345. It is also possible that Matthew simply used the passive out of force of habit, as Senior urges (*Passion*, 251 and #3). Trilling, *Wahre*, 74 also considers the possibility.

Mk ἐκράξαν 15:14) signifies an ongoing action—the demand for Barabbas is in the aorist, but the rejection of Jesus is recurrent.⁶²⁰

To this must be added Matthew's intention to exculpate Pilate. Matthew's two inclusions to Mark's account are particularly decisive in this respect. The first, 27:19, describes how Pilate's wife under the influence of a dream advises Pilate to have nothing to do with that "innocent man"—a caution which he observes. Such receptivity on the part of a Roman presents a striking contrast to the hostility Jesus faces from his own people, and their leaders in particular. This contrast is intensified in the second inclusion (27:24)⁶²¹ where in washing his hands Pilate expressly dissociates himself from the responsibility for Jesus' death.⁶²²

The most decisive component of the entire pericope is the moment when the crowds join with the leaders and together as πᾶς ὁ λαός assume collective responsibility for Jesus' death. In Matthew's representation the guilt of the crowds is twofold. The first part of this is indicated by the change from ὄχλου in 24 to λαός in 25—a change which signifies that they have implicitly associated themselves with their leaders and their leaders' intentions. This is a decisive move; after this the crowds are no longer mentioned in the gospel—only οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (28:15) or ὁ λαός (26:64). Thus, by Matthew's account, the crowds, in siding with their leaders, have finally and decisively relinquished their support for Jesus and chosen to follow their leaders instead.

The crowds, as a component of πᾶς ὁ λαός, make themselves guilty of Jesus'

⁶²⁰ Cf. Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 94; Weiss, *Matthäus-Evangelium*, 482 and Gundry, *Matthew*, 564 "Atypically he turns Mark's aorist into the imperfect to stress that they repeatedly yelled for Jesus' crucifixion".

⁶²¹ There is a broad spectrum of opinion concerning the exact provenance of both passages, but it is generally agreed that even if they are traditional or legendary in background both show signs of Matthean activity or as Kilpatrick opines—"strong traces of Matthean style" (*Origins*, 47). Dibelius, *Formgeschichte*, 197 regards both as legendary. Trilling, (*Wahre*, 67) regards 19 as traditional, while K.H. Schelkle, "Die 'Selbstverfluchung' Israels nach Matthäus 27,23-25" in Eckert, *Antijudaismus*, 148-156, 149) regards 24f. as traditional. On the other hand, Dahl, "Passion", 50; Gundry, *Matthew*, 565 and Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 47, see 27:24 as Matthean.

⁶²² Gundry, *Matthew* 564 suggests that ἀπέναντι "demarcates Pilate from the 'crowd'". In addition the ἀθῶος and ὑμεῖς ὤψεσθε deliberately recall the ἀθῶον and σὺ ὄψῃ found in the death of Judas pericope at 27:4. The intention is to compare the ὄχλος with Judas (again cf. 26:47). As Van Tilborg perceptively notes (*Leaders*, 94) the history of the Jewish people has already been prefigured in the story about the blood-money". See Senior, *Passion*, 254-255 as well.

blood. The formula they employ has its background in the Old Testament and is implicitly addressed to God.⁶²³ The λαός in appropriating this formula "proclaim before their Lord responsibility for the blood of Jesus".⁶²⁴

Important to note in this context is that πᾶς ὁ λαός does not simply comprise "the Jews who were present when the priests accused Jesus before Pilate" as Kosmala, for one, has argued.⁶²⁵ His word study of λαός significantly fails to examine Matthew's use of the word. Here λαός, as with arguably all the other instances of the word in Matthew, has an undeniable ethnic connotation,⁶²⁶ and signifies all of Israel.

⁶²³ See Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 208ff.; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 220; Senior, *Passion*, 256ff.; Trilling, *Wahre*, 70-72. Fitzmyer, "Anti-Semitism and the Cry of 'All the People'" (Mt 27:25) *TS* 26 (1965) 667-671, 69 #10 notes that "the phrase is an Old Testament expression for responsibility incurred in the death of a person The additional phrase involving the offspring is also an Old Testament trait".

⁶²⁴ Senior, *Passion*, 257.

⁶²⁵ H. Kosmala, "His Blood on Us and on our Children" (the Background of Mt. 27, 24-25) *ASTI* 7 (1970) 94-126, 98.

⁶²⁶ In marked contradistinction to Luke, Matthew rarely, if at all, uses λαός of the crowds (see Garland, *Intention*, 40 #20; Kodell, *Laos*, 334-335; McNeile, *Saint Matthew*, 305 —Matthew "never uses . . . [λαός] without the thought of the Jewish nation as such" Fitzmyer, "Cry", 669. Of the fourteen occurrences of the word in Matthew's gospel, Strathmann ("λαός" *TDNT* IV (with R. Meyer, 29-57) instances only four which he regards as synonymous with ὄχλος; 4:23; 26:5; 27:25; 27:64. Even these four should probably not be regarded as strictly synonymous. The first, 4:2, has been introduced to emphasize the fulfillment of the prophecy at 4:16 (and possibly 2:6 as well). Γαλιλαία is the *Stichwort* and 23 elaborates on the significance of the light in 4:16. See Citron, "Multitudes", 409 who argues differently, and also Senior, *Passion*, 259. With respect to 26:5 and 27:64 it is important to recognize that the designation λαός occurs in the mouths of the leaders of the people (Garland, *Intention*, 40 #22; Gibbs, "Purpose", 451) and ought to be considered in light of this. The usage here may approximate the crowds (cf. 21:26), but the story of the guard at the tomb (28:15 παρὰ Ἰουδαίους) suggests that it carries an ethnic connotation as well. Cf. Senior, *Passion*, 249. As to 27:25, the above noted fact that ὄχλοι does not occur again after 27:25 suggests that the Jewish people as a whole are in view (this identity is supported by most commentators—see the extensive list in Senior, *Passion*, 238 #5 and to it add (among others) Beare, *Matthew*, 531; Davies, *SSM* 290 (implicitly); Garland, *Intention*, 40; Gundry, *Matthew*, 565 (implicitly); Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 210; Kodell, "Laos", 334; Kretzer, *Herrschaft*, 79 #85; Ogawa, *L'histoire*, 220.

With respect to 27:25 Kingsbury (*Parable*, 26) argues that while the use of λαός does not reveal an inclination to spare the crowds: "the substitution of the term λαός for ὄχλος at least complies with the general Matthean tendency to place the ὄχλος, as a district group in a neutral or even a positive light". It is difficult, however, in light of the above-mentioned redactional charges Matthew has made to Mark, to see how the substitution mitigates in the least the complicity of the crowds. Rather, it reveals how, in the space of some ten verses, their position comes more and more to approximate that of the leaders, until, at 27:25, they have aligned themselves entirely with their leaders (although this does not imply that the term λαός is "aligned with the Pharisaic party" as Gibbs, ("Purpose" 451) argues. It means simply that the ὄχλοι and leaders can now be treated as one). Thus, 27:25 does not spare the crowds, but represents the nadir of their characterization in the gospel.

Several scholars have remarked on the fact that Jesus' ministry to the crowds is sandwiched between 4:23 and 27:25, that is to say between Jesus' first ministry to his λαός, and their final rejection of him. (Garland, *Intention*, 140; Gibbs, "Purpose", 451; Suhl, "Davidssohn", 78. Suhl argues that the ἐν τῷ λαῷ has been omitted from 9:35 (cf. the // 4:23) so that this configuration would occur.) Although Van Tilborg, (*Leaders*, 94 #3) is correct in his observation that this pattern is not as clear as it might be, as far as Matthew's own use of the term is concerned (vs. the leaders') this seems to hold. Gibbs is also correct in his suggestion that "Matthew employs οἱ ὄχλοι . . . to emphasize the gulf between the masses and the Pharisees" (Purpose, 451). Suhl, "Davidssohn", 78-79

Moreover, it represents Israel at a decisive moment in salvation history, namely the point where they divorce themselves from God, and relinquish their role as the people of God. At the end of the gospel, they are simply οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, because in invoking the curse on themselves they have cut themselves off from their position as God's people

Conclusion

To conclude, the dominant element of Matthew's characterization of the crowds in the Barabbas pericope is their culpability. Through a whole series of changes to Mark, Matthew has consistently and deliberately inculpated them in Jesus' death, until finally at 27:25 they join with their leaders in assuming responsibility for his crucifixion. There is no doubt that the leaders are also condemned, but Matthew's main intention is to show that "all the people" bear responsibility for Jesus' death.

One key element here is obviously *heilsgeschichtlich*. The events of the Passion comprise the ὅλον mentioned at 26:56 and represent the fulfillment of οἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν. For Matthew this fulfillment includes not only the fate of Jesus, but the role of Israel—including the crowds—in putting Jesus to death. In doing so, and in collectively assuming responsibility for it, they unwittingly bring one phase of salvation history to a close, and make way for the next.

There is also an apologetic side to the account. Matthew wants to make it incontrovertible that all the Jewish people, the crowds and leaders, put to death their own Messiah and cut themselves off from being God's chosen people. Though it was all foreseen in αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν the responsibility was, nonetheless, theirs.

The other side of this depiction however may offer a note of invitation. The reason Matthew is so intent on expressing the guilt of the ὄχλοι is to make them

rejects most of Gibbs' arguments, but in so doing he offers no cogent reason for this distinction between ὄχλος, and λαός. Gibbs' approach is better, not only because it explains the above distinction, but because it helps to elucidate the fundamental ambiguity with respect to the crowds in the gospel. It accounts on the one hand, for Jesus' ministry amongst the people with his popular acceptance (in the face of the leaders' antipathy). On the other, it helps to make clear how the crowds finally came to join their leaders and ended up rejecting Jesus.

recognize that they had made a mistake and were responsible for it. Once they admitted to having made a mistake, the way would again open for them to rejoin God's chosen people. The divine plan underlying αἱ γραφαί had resulted in salvation for πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. If the ὄχλοι were prepared to relinquish the deceits of their leaders, they would once again, albeit as *primus inter pares*, be part of the people of God.

10. CONCLUSION

What can be said about the crowds in the first gospel? Has the analysis been able to account for Matthew's "somewhat ambivalent" portrayal? The answer would have to be yes. The ambiguity of this portrayal appears to be the result of Matthew's incorporation of two powerful and contradictory motifs.

The first is christological. Roughly speaking this motif draws in all the "positive" depictions of the crowds—their following Jesus, their laudatory comments and reactions, and their nascent (and not so nascent) christological asseverations. All of these elements are intimately bound with Christ—his words and especially his works. And all of these elements are specifically formulated so as to reflect the ἐξουσία and more particularly the compassion and πραΰτης of Jesus the servant of the Lord. Here the crowds embody a helpless Israel gratefully receiving the ministrations of its Lord.

The second is primarily *heilsgeschichtlich* and can be said to represent the obverse side of Israel—that which had always rejected the messengers sent to her. Here, especially in the identification of Jesus as prophet, the hostility of the crowds is adumbrated until it effloresces in the passion account. The crowds end up siding with their obdurate leaders and together, as the people of Israel, collectively relinquish their role as the people of God.

Central to both these representations is their situation in Old Testament prophecy. The role of a grateful Israel is a necessary corollary to Jesus as servant, while the rejection of Jesus by the crowds is grounded in αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν. Yet for Matthew this does not represent a fundamental contradiction. Both elements are

foreordained, and each assumes a particular prominence at a set point in his gospel account. For him there is no ambiguity—the crowds as part of Israel, have in his account only brought to fulfillment what had long been prophesied about them.

To these motifs should also be appended the apologetic element in Matthew's portrayal. Matthew, on the one hand, beginning with his preference for the plural form ὄχλοι, indicates the widespread support of the crowds for Jesus during his ministry, a support that continued up to, and beyond the popular acclaim of the Triumphal Entry. In marked contradistinction to their leaders, the crowds in following him, in being healed up by him and in marvelling at his words and deeds, indicated a developing awareness and interest in Jesus himself. On the other hand, Matthew demonstrates how the malign influence of the Jewish leaders, coupled with the crowds' own failure to understand, resulted in their complicity in his death. Matthew shows that their only partial understanding of the Son of David and their misapprehension of Jesus as a prophet were ultimately culpable and led inexorably to their own relinquishing of their status as God's chosen people. In sum, his apologetic explains how the ὄχλοι came close to recognizing their messiah, but how they rejected him in the end.

PART III

1. INTRODUCTION

From the foregoing analysis it is clear that the crowds play a vital role in Matthew's "historical" narrative of Jesus. Nevertheless, the perspective derived from the historical narrative is not, of itself, sufficient to explain the characterization of the crowds. The ambiguity remarked on in Chapter 1 remains, and the disparagement of the crowds in Chapter 13 does not sit easily with the acclamations made by the crowds during the Triumphal Entry in Chapter 21. Nor does it fit with the understated, if increasingly flattering, portrait of the crowds which emerges over the course of the gospel narrative. The solution taken here, will be to consider some of these references in a transparent light. Notwithstanding views to the contrary, this is best seen as being in keeping with the gospel.⁶²⁷ Raymond Brown, for instance, says of Matthew, that "for the purposes of detecting life in the last third of the first century (the Sub-Apostolic Period), Matthew is almost as revelatory as John...Both Matthew and John have interwoven their understanding of the post-resurrectional era into the account of Jesus' public ministry."⁶²⁸

This naturally raises various methodological questions, most notably, how the exegete is to distinguish between what is "historical" and what is transparent. Held, for his part, advocates understanding every possible passage as transparent,⁶²⁹ while Sanders and Davies caution that "any one-to-one reading off of the experience of Matthew's church from the stories of Jesus in the gospel is too simplistic to be convincing."⁶³⁰ Both of these positions are a bit extreme, and it appears that the best resolution of these views is to consider the relevant passages on an individual basis, to make certain that they warrant being interpreted transparently. For this reason, a

⁶²⁷ The objections to a transparent understanding of the crowds will be dealt with more fully below.

⁶²⁸ R. E. Brown, *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind* (New York: Paulist 1984) 125. For a fascinating discussion of John in this light see J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, (New York: Harper and Row, 1968).

⁶²⁹ Held, *TIM*.

⁶³⁰ Sanders and Davies, *Studying*, 206-07.

rationale will be offered for most of the passages discussed below, justifying their interpretation in a transparent light. This should also help to offset the problem of overinterpretation to which the crowds have been subject.

Unfortunately, this approach, in itself, is insufficient. The references to the crowds are limited in number, and cohere well with the "historical" component of the gospel.⁶³¹ Rather than attempt to consider these individual references on their own, without a particular context, it seems safer to approach the crowds through Matthew's community. This has two advantages. The first is that it would likely reflect Matthew's own understanding, since his view of the crowds is going to be determined by their stance *vis-à-vis* his community. Second, the references to the community are more profuse than those to the crowds, and, for that reason, it is to be hoped, less open to misinterpretation. This is not to suggest that there is absolute accord amongst scholars about the nature of Matthew's church, but there is, nevertheless, a measure of agreement.⁶³² The procedure that will be followed here, therefore, is to discuss the stage and situation of the community first, and then the situation and setting of the crowds.

By implying that there is more than simply one stage, I am suggesting that the transparent references to the crowds and disciples are not static, and that they likely indicate various phases in the experience of both groups.⁶³³ In the case of the church,

⁶³¹ Apart from Chapter 13, the only passage discussed above which appears to make an unequivocal reference to the later community is 9:8.

⁶³² In the discussion which follows, "Matthew's church" and "Matthew's community" will be regarded as synonyms. For discussions of Matthew's church see, among others, R. Brown, *Churches*, 124-45; R. Brown and J. Meier, *Antioch*, 45-72; Seán Freyne, "Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus" in J. Neusner and E. Frerichs (eds.), *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity*, (Scholars Press Studies in the Humanities Series. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985) 117-43; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 114ff.; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 82-90; Eugene LaVerdière and William Thompson, "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke", *TS* 37 (1976), 567-97; James Martin, "The Church in Matthew", *Int* 29 (1975) 41-56; Wayne A. Meeks, "Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities" in Neusner, *Ourselves*, 93-115; Schweizer, *Gemeinde*, *passim*.

⁶³³ Matthew's reason for wanting to include an account of these phases within his church is twofold. First, like the book of Acts, it serves as a record of the activity and authority of the Risen Jesus at work within his church. Second, it functions as a means of assuring Matthew's community that even in moments of crisis, Jesus is still with them. By making the gospel reflect the experiences of his community, Matthew is able to prove to them that just as Jesus was there for the disciples at 28:20 so, too, does he remain *with them* even after the disciples are gone.

one obvious shift of phase occurs with the change in mission directives, where it moves from a particularist ministry to Israel, to a universalist ministry which encompasses the gentiles and Israel.⁶³⁴ For the crowds, a change in attitude might be inferred from the differences which emerge between passages like 9:8 and 13:10-23. In the foregoing discussion of the crowds at the historical level, both were adjudged to have transparent features. If this is so, however, the passages themselves, suggest a significant movement from the crowds' reverent astonishment described at 9:8 to their final obduracy at 13:10 ff..⁶³⁵

Such a discussion, of course, assumes that both groups ought to be interpreted transparently. As this is by no means a universally accepted conclusion, it is necessary to see if such a supposition is warranted. Accordingly, each of the gospel's three groups - the disciples, Jewish leaders, and the crowds, will be examined to see if this is, in fact, a legitimate premise.

2. THE GROUPS IN MATTHEW

2a. *The Disciples*

Among recent scholars, Strecker has been the most vocal against seeing the disciples in Matthew as transparent for members of his Community. He maintains that through conscious "historicizing" Matthew emerges with different periods of salvation history, and "the central epoch of history is the 'time of Jesus', the time when Jesus is sent exclusively to the people of Israel....The disciples of Jesus are a part of the uniqueness of this epoch."⁶³⁶ Because this period of time is part of the holy, unrepeatable past, the disciples are best seen as idealized exemplars for the later community.⁶³⁷ Ulrich Luz has responded to each of these contentions point for point,

⁶³⁴ Such a shift is typical of the early church in general. See E. Best, "The Revelation to Evangelize the Gentiles", *JTS* (NS) 35 (1984) 1-30.

⁶³⁵ That the movement of the crowds is away from the church, and not the reverse, is shown by 13:19, and, albeit obliquely, by the Great Commission.

⁶³⁶ Strecker, "Concept", 73; and *Weg* 191 - 206.

⁶³⁷ Strecker, *Weg*, 193-94.

and determined instead, that "the disciples are transparent for the present situation. Behind them stands Matthew's Community".⁶³⁸

2b. *The Jewish Leaders*

The representation of the Jewish leaders in Matthew is in some ways problematic. According to Van Tilborg, Matthew does not generally maintain distinctions between the various groups - their designations are, in fact, interchangeable.⁶³⁹ This explains why Matthew has no qualms about indiscriminately using the appellation "scribes and Pharisees" (5:20; 12:38; 15:1; 23:2,13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29) which lumps the two together, or the even more problematic "Pharisees and Sadducees" (3:7; 16:1,6,11,12(*bis*))⁶⁴⁰ The latter is generally taken as an egregious error on Matthew's part reflecting his ignorance (and possibly his gentile background).⁶⁴¹ It indicates that individual distinctions which pertained in the past have become blurred so that in Hummel's words "Im Matthäusevangelium sieht sich die Gemeinde einer geschlossenen Front des Judentums gegenüber."⁶⁴³

On the basis of these findings Strecker has argued that the Jewish Leaders do not reflect the contemporary Community's situation in relation to Judaism, but rather have "the function of a topos, which represents the attitude of unbelief and thus also of iniquity, in contrast to the ethical demand."⁶⁴² Van Tilborg in his study of the Jewish leaders emerges with similar findings. Matthew "pictures the Jewish leaders as the antitype of the 'Christian'", a negative construct which argues for "a fairly great and

⁶³⁸ Luz, "Disciples" 110, and cf. 99-110 for a detailed refutation of Strecker's position.

⁶³⁹ Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 6. For a discussion of the various groups cf. 1-6 and Hummel *Auseinandersetzung* 12-22 and Rolf Walker, *Heilsgeschichte* 11-29. Garland's Appendix B (*Intention* 218-21) offers a helpful chart comparing Matthew's designations of the leaders with those in Mark and Luke. See, as well, the chart and discussion by Paul Winter (*Trial* 171-77) on the Jewish leaders in the passion narrative and A.F.J. Klijn, "Scribes, Pharisees, Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament" *NovT* 3 (1959) 259-67.

⁶⁴⁰ Van Tilborg suggests both formulations are largely editorial, *Leaders* 2,4. With respect to the latter, Jean Le Moyne (*Les Sadducéens*, Paris: Gabalda, 1972, 123) opines "Quant à la formule 'Pharisiens et Sadducéens'...c'est un assemblage artificiel qui ne représente pas la réalité historique."

⁶⁴¹ See e.g. Meier, *Law*, 18-19.

⁶⁴² Strecker, "Concept", 75. cf. *Weg* 140-41.

satisfactory distance on a historical level" from the Jews themselves.⁶⁴³ Thus Matthew has no intention whatsoever of reflecting contemporary Judaism, he is far more concerned with providing ethical directives for his community. Thus it is no coincidence at all that Chapter 23 with its philippic against the scribes and Pharisees is actually addressed to the disciples and the crowds (23:1).⁶⁴⁴

Does this suggest then that the Jewish leaders in Matthew are largely a literary construct? It cannot be said that it does. For one thing, it is not quite true that Matthew's designations for the Jewish leaders are all interchangeable. Matthew shows a marked preference for depicting the Pharisees as Jesus' enemies.⁶⁴⁵ Yet, in spite of this preference, he has largely preserved the second evangelist's passion account, in which, responsibility for Jesus' death lies with the chief priests, scribes and elders and not the Pharisees.⁶⁴⁶

Nor need it be said that Matthew was oblivious to the distinctions between the scribes and Pharisees. Martin Hengel, in a pointed rejoinder to Strecker, explains this expression as a reference to the emergent חכמים.⁶⁴⁷ As to the Pharisees and the Sadducees, Davies and Allison have recently contended that "the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (16:12) "is no more than a convenient phrase indicating shared error".⁶⁴⁸ Indeed, one might say on the basis of their interpretation that this

⁶⁴³ Van Tilborg, *Leaders*, 170, 171. Garland (*Intention*, 45-46) also gives support to this position: "all the leaders of the Jews have been stereotyped as false, mostly under the rubric of the Pharisees". Cf. Gaston, "Messiah", 34.

⁶⁴⁴ See Stanton, "Origin" 1920.

⁶⁴⁵ Cf. Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 14; Verseput, *Rejection*, 51-52 and the caveat at #127; Trilling, *Wahre*, 90-91; Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 302; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 170. Note should be taken of the fact that Bultmann (*HST* 52-54) sees a tendency in the synoptic tradition to identify Jesus' opponents as scribes and Pharisees. Garland (*Intention*, 44#32) argues that the intensity of Matthew's anti-Pharisaic invective has its analog in Luke, but this is hardly the case. There is certainly tension, but not, as Tannehill indicates (*Unity* 170), irreconcilable conflict - "Through much of the gospel the two sides remain in conversation. This is highlighted by the fact that Jesus is repeatedly invited to dinner by Pharisees and accepts these invitations." Matthew's depiction, by contrast, is one of irreconcilable conflict.

⁶⁴⁶ Winter, *Trial*, 174, cf. 172-73. The Pharisees only reappear after the burial at 27:62. H.F. Weiss ("φαρισαῖος" *TDNT* IX 35-48, 37) says of the synoptic tradition that "this is obviously and indisputably an authentic and reliable reminiscence, especially in view of the general tendency of the Gospels to present the Pharisees as the chief adversaries of Jesus bearing much of the responsibility for his death".

⁶⁴⁷ Martin Hengel, "Zur matthäischen Bergpredigt und ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund" *TR* 52 (1987) 327-400, 374. More scathing is Hengel's observation that Strecker "neuere grundlegende Literatur souverän mißachtet" (374).

⁶⁴⁸ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 32. They account for Matthew's omission of Mark's

phrase embodies the tension which characterizes Matthew's approach. On the one hand, he is concerned with the historical account, which is presumably the rationale underlying his inclusion of the Sadducees (even if that account is artificial).⁶⁴⁹ On the other hand, he is concerned to show that the leaders were united in their opposition to Jesus and so formed what Trilling has styled as a 'Front'.⁶⁵⁰

Finally, Strecker's argument that the leaders function as a *topos* does not account for the primacy of the Pharisees in the gospel. It seems particularly odd that Matthew only puts the references to the Pharisees in Jesus' public ministry and not the passion account. If the references were to be taken as *topoi*, then what better place than the passion account to add them? Nor, as Przybylski has argued,⁶⁵¹ is it convincing to suppose that a purely academic construct would justify the invective and abuse that Matthew heaps upon the Pharisees. Certainly Chapter 23 begins with a reference to the disciples and the crowds, and has an undeniable didactic function, but can this alone account for such an apostrophizing of the Pharisees? It hardly seems likely. Hengel is surely correct that "Mt 23 wäre ohne eine *akute* Auseinandersetzung mit den jüdischen Führern nicht geschrieben worden."⁶⁵² It is well known that Clark has argued the reverse, albeit in a more general sense,⁶⁵³ dismissing as "quite subjective and merely speculative" the idea that a former Jew would react violently against his one-time faith. Yet surely his own speculation is at least as conjectural; following his line one could argue that a loving wife would never spurn her husband. One hardly needs to experience the rancour of the divorce courts to admit the falseness

attributive clause about the Sadducees (οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι Mk 12:18 to λέγοντες μὴ ἀνάστασιν Mt 22:23) by suggesting on the basis of textual evidence that οἱ has dropped out by homoteleuton. Failing that, they argue it might be attributed to Matthew's penchant for direct discourse.

⁶⁴⁹ "Die Frage bleibt, warum Matthäus sich dann überhaupt für die Sadduzäer interessiert. Die einzig mögliche Antwort lautet, daß hier ein 'historisierendes' Interesse am Werk ist" (Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 20).

⁶⁵⁰ Trilling, *Wahre*, 91. Luz (*Matthew 1-7*, 170) draws attention to the 'Front's' importance for *Heilsgeschichte*.

⁶⁵¹ Benno Przybylski, "The Setting of Matthean Anti-Judaism" in P. Richardson with D. Granskou (eds.) *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*, Vol 1 (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1986) 181-200, 188-89.

⁶⁵² Hengel, "Bergpredigt", 375. Italics his.

⁶⁵³ K.W. Clark, ("Bias" 2) writes "a Jewish Christian of about 90 A.D. would hardly be found writing a gospel whose theme is the definite and final rejection of Israel by her God."

of such a supposition. By the same token, Matthew's community has just undergone an acrimonious divorce with the Jewish community, and it is this state of affairs which underlies his rancour.⁶⁵⁴ For all the reasons then, it seems more satisfactory to account for Matthew's preoccupation with the Pharisees by supposing that they represent contemporary Judaism.⁶⁵⁵

2c. *The Crowds*

If the crowds represent the Jewish crowds on the "historical" level of the Gospel, what of the "transparent" level? Although Verseput and Garland have both argued that the crowds are historicized and belong to the unrepeatable past,⁶⁵⁶ this does not seem likely. The main reason for this is that both the disciples and the Jewish leaders are understood transparently. It would be odd indeed, if Matthew only interpreted two of the three major groups in his gospel in such a light. Nor would he have a reason for doing so. The crowds would hardly have ceased to exist after Jesus' resurrection!

What is less easy to ascertain, is the crowds' ultimate status. There is a considerable difference of opinion on this question, some holding that the crowds become members of Matthew's Community, others, that they remain Jews separate from the community. The first of these alternatives has a number of adherents. Gundry, for example, holds that the crowds "represent the masses in the church, professing disciples both true and false - the result of extensive evangelism among the Gentiles".⁶⁵⁷ Minear's view is similar.⁶⁵⁸ A related view is advocated by Legasse,

⁶⁵⁴ "The kind of anti-Pharisaism here evidenced is far too intense to be a matter of literary convention as in Luke. Some kind of unhappy contact with Pharisaism is required to explain the hostility of the author." (Hare, *Persecution*, 96).

⁶⁵⁵ "Certainly there is no better way of explaining Matthew's attitude towards the Pharisees: his words about them evince a special living concern" (Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 302). See too, Beare, *Matthew*, 93; Hill, *Matthew*, 92 "may"; H. C. Kee, *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective*, (London: SCM, 1980) 142; S. Legasse, "L' 'antijudaïsme' dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu" in *L'Évangile* 417-28, 418; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 170; Wayne Meeks, "Breaking Away" 109; J. Andrew Overman, *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 145 ff..

⁶⁵⁶ Verseput, *Rejection*, 48; Garland, *Intention*, 38-39.

⁶⁵⁷ Gundry, *Matthew*, 65.

⁶⁵⁸ Minear, "Crowds" 39-42.

Gibbs and others.⁶⁵⁹ Donahue would see the crowds as "potential believers in Matthew's own day".⁶⁶⁰

Do the crowds become a part of Matthew's community? Two reasons are commonly adduced in support of this position. The first is that the crowds follow Jesus, and their following is taken as a sign of their present (and future) commitment.⁶⁶¹ Yet in light of the discussion on ἀκολουθέω given above, such an argument is untenable. Matthew never has Jesus summon the crowds to follow him. The clear implication is that Matthew did not look upon the crowds as adherents.

The second reason put forward, is that Matthew's feeding accounts appear to have a eucharistic component to them.⁶⁶² Since the crowds are the express recipients of the bread broken by Jesus and given to the disciples for distribution (14:19; 15:36), should the crowds then be regarded as members of Matthew's church? This position has not wanted for advocates,⁶⁶³ and there are some good reasons for supposing that the feeding narratives are eucharistic. According to Held,⁶⁶⁴ Matthew has limited references to fish in these accounts so as to draw attention to the bread. Gundry holds that the omission of the division of the crowds into groups also helps to portray them "as the whole, undivided church",⁶⁶⁵ suggesting their association with the later Christian community.

This view, however, is overstated. Gnika's examination of these narratives leads him to conclude that "eine eucharistische Implikation lässt sich nicht

⁶⁵⁹ S. Legasse, "Les Miracles de Jésus selon Matthieu" in Leon Dufour (ed.), *Les Miracles de Jésus selon Le Nouveau Testament*. Parole de Dieu (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977) 227-247, 246; Gibbs, "Torah", 45. See also Fenton, *Saint Matthew*, 197; Lohmeyer, *Matthäus*, 78; Aerts, "Suivre", 506.

⁶⁶⁰ Donahue, *Parable*, 68.

⁶⁶¹ "...ce sont les "foules", qui le "suivent" (14,13b; cf. Mc 6,32b). Ce verbe n'est pas neutre dans Matthieu...". Legasse, "Miracles", 245-46. Cf. Aerts "Suivre", 506.

⁶⁶² McNeile, *St. Matthew* 216; Held, *TIM* 187; B. Van Iersel, "Die wunderbar Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition", *NovT* 7 (1964/5) 167-94, 192-94; Donaldson, *Mountain*, 260, #27. Cf. the marked parallels with 1 Co 11:24.

⁶⁶³ "To the degree that these stories were intended by Matthew to mirror later Eucharists to that same degree the *ochloi* represent the laity in those later gatherings." Minear, "Crowds", 31; Cf. Van Tilborg, *Leaders* 162-63, and Gundry, *Matthew* 291f..

⁶⁶⁴ Held, *TIM*, 185-87.

⁶⁶⁵ Gundry, *Matthew*, 294. Gundry also see Matthew's addition of women and children as a reflection of families in the church based on the holy family in chapters 1-2 (295).

nachweisen".⁶⁶⁶ He observes that the features of Jesus' blessing and breaking of the bread are in accord with Jewish table customs,⁶⁶⁷ as is Jesus' omission of the blessing over the fish, particularly in the feeding of the four thousand.⁶⁶⁸ In addition to Gnilka's arguments, it has to be said that the omission of Mark's groupings might just as well be attributed to Matthew's penchant for abbreviation. For these reasons, the feeding narratives cannot be said to be unequivocally eucharistic. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that they echo the Last Supper. These echoes are not, however, of themselves, sufficiently strong to suggest that this was one of Matthew's prevailing concerns.⁶⁶⁹

At least as strong is Matthew's emphasis on healing. Both his accounts are preceded by healings, (not least of which is Matthew's summary at 15:29-31), and it is his healing which helps to explain why the crowds are there in the first place. Moreover, the feeding accounts themselves are not unrelated to healing, insofar as both are provoked by the same reaction in Jesus. At 14:14 it is Jesus' compassion for the crowds which prompts him to heal them, while at 15:32 it is this very same reaction which induces him to feed them.⁶⁷⁰ In each case, Jesus' reaction is a response to specific physical needs on the part of the crowds. This correlation is different from that

⁶⁶⁶ Gnilka, *Matthäusevangelium*, II 38. The above assessment is made of 15:32-39. A similar opinion is expressed concerning 14:13-21 at II 9.

⁶⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 9; cf. the judgement of Samuel Tobias Lachs (*A Rabbinic Commentary of the New Testament; The Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Hoboken: Ktav, 1987) 241) that in all three synoptic gospels, "Jesus here follows the rabbinic procedure at table" and cites M Ber 8:7; B Ber 35a, 46a; TJ *ibid.* 8, 11a(41); B Hul 7b; B RH 29b in this regard.

⁶⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 38. He cites M Ber 6:7 "This is the general rule: where there is a main food and aught that is but an accompaniment to it, the Benediction should be said over the main food and it need not be said over the accompaniment." Of Matthew's omission of Mk 14:41b, Gnilka says that "die Nichterwähnung des Fischmahles besagt nicht viel, weil die zwei Fische ausdrücklich in die Eulogie miteinbezogen werden" (II 9).

⁶⁶⁹ Even if the references were less equivocal than they are, it would still need to be asked whether the disciples and the crowds are equally important here. Held's analysis, while acknowledging the eucharistic emphasis, also notes the stress on the mediating role of the disciples in Matthew's accounts (TIM 184,87). This stress leads one to wonder whether these accounts might not be better taken as prescriptions for the type of behaviour which characterizes the Christian minister. A comparison with the "parable" of the sheep and the goats is instructive. Here one of the characteristics of the 'sheep' is that they gave food to Jesus to eat (ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν) a passage which is clearly reminiscent of Jesus' charge to the disciples in the feeding of the five thousand (δοτε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν 14:16).

⁶⁷⁰ "Die Tradition von den Schafen, die keinen Hirten haben, nimmt Matthäus an anderer Stelle (Matth. 9,36 [from 14:14]) auf, nun aber in der Weise, daß unmittelbar zuvor summarisch Krankenheilungen erwähnt werden." G. Braumann, "Jesu Erbarmen nach Matthäus" TZ 19 (1963) 305-17, 310#23.

in Mark, even though Mark has the same references to compassion, since, in his account of the feeding of the five thousand, Jesus' compassion is expressed in the form of teaching (Mk 6:34; cf. Mk 8:2). Matthew's focus here is the same as the one which leads him to eschew the LXX's spiritualized version of Isaiah 53:4 (Mt 8:17). He is more concerned to delineate the physical needs of the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and show how Jesus, like God, the shepherd of Ezekiel 34, "will feed them on the mountains of Israel" and "bind up the crippled...and...strengthen the weak" (Ez 34:13,16). Such an emphasis is, however, far more expressive of a therapeutic ministry on the part of Matthew's church than of a eucharistic one.

Matthew offers other intimations that the crowds did not later become members of Matthew's church. One of these, is the interrelation of the crowds to the "Great Discourses" of the gospel. It was established earlier, that the crowds were the audience for the Sermon on the Mount, part of the parable discourse, and the anti-Pharisaic discourse (which itself is not part of the final discourse).⁶⁷¹ Although the crowds function as a narrative marker for the mission discourse, they are not intended as the audience. The only discourse where the crowds are not at all proximate, is the community discourse. Here their absence is conspicuous. Even though the crowds are often used to signal the advent of a discourse, they do not do so here. Nor, obviously, do they appear to figure as a part of the community since they have not been included as part of the audience. Further evidence of this, is furnished by the parable discourse, where the crowds are privy to none of the interpretations which Jesus offers his disciples. Nor are they recipients of Jesus' private instruction about the last days in chapters 24 - 25. They are however, offered Jesus' *halakah* in the Sermon on the Mount, and issued a warning about the Pharisees in Chapter 23. Both of these features suggest that the crowds are, at one point at least, regarded as having the potential to join the community, but that they have not chosen to do so.

Another factor which suggests the crowds did not become a part of the church

⁶⁷¹ As the frame of reference for the discourses is largely the post-Easter community, it is not inappropriate to consider the crowds in that light as well.

is the interpretation of the parable of the sower. It appears to offer an encapsulation of the divine economy operative within Matthew's church. As was shown in the discussion of chapter 13, the crowds are associated with the seed sown on the path, where the evil one comes and snatches away what is sown in their hearts (13:4,19). In other words, they are not associated with Matthew's community, as their seeds did not even take root.

If the crowds are not a part of the church, are they Jewish or are they gentile? Matthew's repeated use of αὐτῶν in certain contexts suggests that they are Jewish. He uses it chiefly in conjunction with synagogues (4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34 ὑμῶν), but also with cities (11:1) and scribes (7:29). France argues that αὐτῶν is generally dependant on antecedents, but he fails to convince.⁶⁷² For one thing, some of these passages do not have a likely antecedent,⁶⁷³ for another, the cumulative weight of these phrases ought not to be disregarded. Taken as a whole, they are best taken as allusions to Jewish synagogues, scribes and cities. Matthew's Community has broken with mainstream Judaism, and the use of the possessive pronoun reflects this rift.⁶⁷⁴ This being the case, the reference at 7:29 to the crowds' astonishment at Jesus not teaching like "their scribes" implies that the crowds are Jewish.⁶⁷⁵

Another passage which also treats the crowds and the scribes - the healing of the paralytic (9:1-8), makes this explicit. As was shown above,⁶⁷⁶ most commentators are agreed that the crowds' remarks (9:8) apply to the later community. This being so, it is a natural inference to suppose that the crowds making these remarks are also

⁶⁷² France, *Evangelist*, 107 "in most cases". France goes on to argue that "In none of these cases is there any need to understand the author as dissociating himself from synagogues and scribes in general."

⁶⁷³ Davies and Allison (*Saint Matthew* 413) single out 4:23; 12:9 and 13:54 as being without grammatical precedent.

⁶⁷⁴ As Luz has pointed out, (*Matthew* 1-7, 78) Matthew does not speak of "their Pharisees" which strongly suggests that the community has their own synagogues and scribes. The reference to "their cities" implies that the community is situated outside of Palestine. On αὐτῶν see Kilpatrick, *Origins* 110f. who relates this to the *Birkath ha-Minim*. For others who see a split between Church and Synagogue cf. Trilling, *Wahre*, 79; W. Schrage, "συναγωγή κτλ" in *TDNT* 798-852,834 and #232; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew* 1-7, 205; David Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* JSNTSS 25 (Sheffield:JSOT, 1989) 30,185#49; Strecker, *Weg* 30; though see Gnlika, *Matthäusevangelium* I 107 for a different view.

⁶⁷⁵ See Donaldson, *Mountain* 255#50, on their Jewish character.

⁶⁷⁶ Cf. above #267.

transparent for the Jewish crowds of Matthew's day. Otherwise, the remark remains inexplicable. Who else would be likely to make such a statement? It would hardly be uttered by the Jewish leaders of Matthew's day, since they would not allow that the power came from God. For members of Matthew's community, such ἐξουσία would be a matter of course. It could not be a gentile crowd, because then Matthew's use of αὐτῶν would be meaningless. The only group for whom such an utterance really makes sense, is a group of post-Easter Jews.

The above results suggest therefore that the crowds are understood as being transparent for the Jewish crowds encountered by Matthew's community. This result coheres well with Matthew's approach toward the Jewish leaders and disciples, where *mutatis mutandis*, the groups do not qualitatively change. So too, with the crowds. They still represent the dominant group of Judaism, as distinct from their leaders.

Does Matthew therefore understand the crowds as the עַם הָאֶרֶץ of his day?⁶⁷⁷ The question is, in part, clouded by later associations of the words.⁶⁷⁸ The mishnaic use of the term, however, refers to the "common people" who are distinguished from the Pharisees and the *haberim* by the degree to which they adhered, or did not adhere, to purity rules.⁶⁷⁹ Danby describes them as "those Jews who were ignorant of the Law

⁶⁷⁷On the עַם הָאֶרֶץ, see especially Aharon Oppenheimer, *The 'Am Ha-Aretz: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic Roman Period*. tr. D. Levine ALGHJ 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1977) as well as, L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees: The Sociological Background of their Faith*, 2 vols., 3 Ed. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1938, 1962) II 754-61; R. Meyer, "Der 'Am hā-'Ares. Ein Beitrag zur Religionssoziologie Palästinas im ersten und zweiten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert", *Judaica* 3 (1947) 169-99.. George F. Moore, "The Am Ha-Arets (The People of the Land) and the Haberim (Associates)" in Lake and Jackson, *Beginnings* I App. E, 439-45; E.P. Sanders, *Jesus*, 176-99; Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, tr. I. Abrahams (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975) 584-88, 632-39.

⁶⁷⁸The material in the Talmud especially, reflects centuries of interaction between the *am ha-aretz* and the *Soferim* and *Amoraim*. See Oppenheimer for a more extensive discussion, although at times he is less than critical in assessing the provenance, time frame and redaction of his sources. The above work by Urbach has been faulted by Neusner on similar grounds ("The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100" *ANRW* II 19:2, 3-42, 4-14).

⁶⁷⁹Cf. the following Mishnaic references: Pharisees (explicitly) Hag 2:7; (implicitly) Dem 2:1, 3:4 Eduy 1:14; M Sh 3:3, 4:6; Toh 4:5, 7:1,2,5; 8:1,2,3; Maksh 6:3; Teb Y 4:5. *Haberim* Dem 2:3, 6:9, 6:12; Shebi 6:9; Gitt 5:9; Toh 7:4. E. P. Sanders (*Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* London: SCM, 1990, 250) cautions that most of the material concerning the *haberim* is from the second century. This may buttress his supposition that the *haberim* are distinct from the Pharisees, (250) though it is probable that the *haveroth* were comprised of Pharisees. Cp. J. Neusner, "The Fellowship (חבורה) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth" *HTR* 53 (1960) 125-42 - "there is no indication that all Pharisees were members of a fellowship, although all members were Pharisees" (125#1).

and who failed to observe the rules of cleanness and uncleanness and were not scrupulous in setting apart tithes from the produce".⁶⁸⁰ The first part of this definition is remarkably similar to the statement made by the chief priests and Pharisees about the crowd at John 7:49 - ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον ἐπαρτοί εἰσιν.⁶⁸¹ This might argue for a similarity between Matthew's crowds and the עם הארץ. On the other hand, Matthew's concern to depict the crowds as part of the audience for the Sermon on the Mount and the anti-Pharisaic discourse seems to imply they had more of an active concern for the law and rules of purity than one would expect from the עם הארץ.⁶⁸² In addition to this, Hill intimates that the mention of "sinners" at 9:10 should be taken as a reference to the עם הארץ.⁶⁸³ For these reasons, it is best to suppose that, for the post-Easter situation, the "common people" comprise a part of the crowds, but the crowds are by no means synonymous with the עם הארץ.⁶⁸⁴

Conclusion

To sum up, all three of the major groups in Matthew's gospel can be understood transparently. In each instance, the composition of the group is similar to its "historical" counterpart. The "historical" disciples are transparent for members of Matthew's community. By the same token, the "historical" Jewish leaders are transparent for the Jewish leaders of Matthew's day, amongst whom the Pharisees and scribes were assuming an increasingly prominent position. Finally, the "historical" crowds in the gospel are transparent for the Jewish crowds of the post-Easter situation. These crowds are not a part of Matthew's church, nor can it be said that they are

⁶⁸⁰ Danby, *Mishnah*, 793. The references in Aboth (2:6; 5:10) dwell on the ignorance of the "common people".

⁶⁸¹ Cf. SB II 494 ff..

⁶⁸² See in this regard 15:1-20. Oppenheimer, (*Am Ha-Aretz* 220) relates that "the washing of the hands was included among the various stages in the process of admission to the association of *haverim*, and hence it cannot be said that it was customary among all Israel".

⁶⁸³ D. Hill, "On the Use and Meaning of Hosea VI. 6 in Matthew's Gospel" *NTS* 24 (1978) 107-19, 110-13. On the other hand, see the warning by Sanders, *Jesus*, 385#14, and Dunn's reply to Sanders, (J.D.G. Dunn, "Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus" in *Social World* 264-89, 274-80) who argues that "sinner" functions in the gospel as a factional term indicating a departure from Pharisaic covenant righteousness (279). Dunn does not consider whether this epithet might also reflect the stance of Matthew's community, on the analogy of 18:17.

⁶⁸⁴ So too Oppenheimer, *Am Ha-Aretz*, 227-28, of the gospel crowds in general.

identical with the עם הארץ.

3. THE MINISTRY OF MATTHEW'S COMMUNITY

3A. Prelude

Perhaps the best place to begin an analysis of the Post-Easter community and its relationship to the crowds is with the ministry of the community. At first sight, this is rather an odd assertion to make, since, apart from the feeding accounts, the disciples do very little except for healing on one occasion - the boy with a demon (17:14-20), and even then, they are unable to heal him. What is more, all the passages in Mark which recount the actual mission activity of the disciples are conspicuously absent in Matthew.⁶⁸⁵ The reason underlying this however, is not that the disciples do not have a ministry, it is simply that their ministry is eclipsed by that of Jesus. Verse 23:8 relates that the community has one teacher, namely Jesus (cf. 23:10), and the same could be said of healers. During his earthly ministry, therefore, Jesus is depicted as the herald,⁶⁸⁶ teacher, and healer *par excellence*, and he alone teaches and heals. The ἐξουσία imparted to the disciples both in the commissions of chapter 10 and the great commission remains largely within the realm of potentiality - in Matthew the results of neither ministry are described.⁶⁸⁷ These omissions then are, in part at least, christological, and in keeping with Matthew's exalted portrayal of Jesus.

Obviously this presents certain difficulties for examining the activity of the community, since its actions tend to be subordinated to those of Jesus. A christology

⁶⁸⁵ Cf. Mk 6:12-13 "So they went out and preached that men should repent. (13) And they cast out many demons, and anointed with oil many that were sick and healed them." Similarly, the return of the apostles (Mk 6:30) has been excised by Matthew; "The apostles returned to Jesus, and told him all that they had done and taught." Cf. too, Mk 9:38.

⁶⁸⁶ John the Baptist is described as preaching, but this is clearly related to his status as forerunner of Jesus (17:10-13), and his preaching is confined to the time prior to Jesus' own baptism and ministry.

⁶⁸⁷ Karen Barta ("Mission in Matthew: The Second Discourse as Narrative", *SBL 1988 Seminar Papers* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988, 527-535; 530) is correct in asserting that the mission actually took place; 10:5 makes this indubitable (though as Beare ("Mission" 12) notes, the whole mission "story (as apart from the charge) shrinks to the words: "These twelve Jesus sent out" (10:5)". She is perhaps missing the point when she argues that Matthew excises the disciples' return because the mission was a failure (531).

as exalted as Matthew's inevitably casts an extensive shadow, and it is not always apparent whether the situation of the community is being obscured by this shadow. Of course, it is not Matthew's intention to downplay the role of the community, but merely to demonstrate that it is completely aligned with the ministry of Jesus. It does, however, make it difficult to decide whether certain passages are dominated more by Matthew's christology or his ecclesiology. For this reason, the examination of the passages which follow, constitutes more of a sketch than a detailed portrait.

3b. *The Ministry of the Community*

Perhaps the most apposite place to begin an account of the Post Easter Church is at the beginning of the 'Mission Discourse', since it is here that Jesus first formally draws the disciples' attention to the crowds, and it is here that he empowers them to carry out a ministry to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' by giving them his ἐξουσία (10:1). This also transpires in Mark (6:7) and Luke (9:1), but in Matthew it is more far-reaching. In Mark they are only given authority over unclean spirits, and in Luke, ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν. In Matthew, however, it is authority over unclean spirits and "to heal every disease and infirmity" (ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν αὐτὰ καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν). Matthew has stressed the healing element through his addition of μαλακίαν, and its absolute efficacy is emphasized by the twice-iterated πᾶσαν.⁶⁸⁸

The healing component is stressed again when Jesus sends them out. After charging them to go only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel and to proclaim the nearness of the kingdom (10:6-7) he gives them specific instructions about healing. They are to "heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out demons" (10:8a). This emphasis is unique to Matthew, as Mark has no healing terminology at this point (cf. 3:15; 6:7) and Luke only καὶ ἰᾶσθαι [τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς] (9:2). Once again, Matthew

⁶⁸⁸ That these are not insignificant changes can be adjudged from the place of both ἐξουσία and πᾶς in the mouth of the risen Jesus (28:18).

has chosen to stress the healing component of the disciples' mission.

The most characteristic reason for such an emphasis is christological. It is apparent that Matthew is intent upon relating the activity of the disciples to that of Jesus.⁶⁸⁹ This correlation is brought out by the fact that the kerygma of the disciples is virtually identical to that of Jesus (4:17b).⁶⁹⁰ This correlation becomes more fully developed at 10:8. Here the disciples are charged to undertake a variety of healing tasks, none of which is expressly paralleled in either Mark or Luke.⁶⁹¹ Each of these tasks recalls a healing performed by Jesus in the miracle sequence 8:1 - 9:34: ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε - 8:5-13; 8:14-16; 9:1-8; 9:27-31, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε - 9:18-26, λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε - 8:2-4, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε - 8:16; 8:28-34. Matthew is once again intent on demonstrating that the nature and range of the disciples' ministry is identical to that of Jesus.⁶⁹²

The equation between the healing ministries of Jesus and the disciples is also emphasized by the list of miracles at 11:2ff., which Jesus presents as evidence to the followers of John the Baptist. As Held has astutely noted,⁶⁹³ this section has been placed after the Mission Discourse instead of in a more natural sequence⁶⁹⁴ so as to include the healing and kerygmatic actions performed by the disciples. In this way, both their actions and those of Jesus are to be construed as proof for John's followers and as fulfilment of Isaiah 35:5-6 and 61:1.

The above features make it apparent that Matthew has carefully equated the therapeutic and kerygmatic activity of the disciples with that of Jesus. Like their master,

⁶⁸⁹ Brown, "Mission", 78; Luz, "Disciples", 100; Held, *TIM*, 249f.; K. Thieme, "Matthäus, der schriftgelehrte Evangelist", *Judaica* 5 (1949) 130-52, 161-82, 137.

⁶⁹⁰ Μετανοεῖτε (4:17a) is not found at 10:7 and is probably an echo of the Baptist's proclamation at 3:2.

⁶⁹¹ Luke's τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς is textually uncertain. See Metzger, *Textual*, 146-7.

⁶⁹² As Held *TIM* 250 and note #3 observes, the only task that Jesus performed that is not replicated here is the healing of the blind 9:27-31. Worth noting though are Matthew's additions to the miracle sequence which, as Luz ("Disciples" 120 #17) has shown, are designed to relate to 10:1,8 and 11:5f.. See too, Schweizer "Observance", 219-20, and *Gemeinde* 20-21; W. Wilkens, "Die Komposition des Matthäus-Evangeliums", *NTS* 31 (1985), 24-38, 27.

⁶⁹³ Held, *TIM* 252, cf. Freyne, *Twelve* 171.

⁶⁹⁴ This list of miracles is from Q (Manson, *Sayings* 66-67) and can be said to follow a more natural sequence in Luke (7:18ff.) since it is placed right after the healing of the Centurion's servant (7:1-10, Mt 8:5-13) and the raising of the widow's son at Nain (7:11-17).

the disciples go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (15:24, 10:5), of which the crowds are a constituent. Given the christological emphasis here, is there an ecclesiological one as well? Several features would suggest that there is. This conclusion can be drawn from the changes Matthew has made to the pericope at 11:2ff.. As Schweizer has noted, Matthew gives Jesus' reply to John's disciples in the present tense. Unlike Luke, who gives the reply in the aorist - ἃ εἶδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε 7:22, Matthew has ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε 11:4.⁶⁹⁵ Such a formulation suggests that preaching and healing continue in the Post Easter church. The community continues to exercise the ἐξουσία imparted to them by Jesus.

An ecclesiological orientation can also be identified in the open-ended character of the mission. While in the other two gospels the disciples return and tell Jesus what they have done (Mk 6:30-31; Lk 9:10a cf. 10:17) this does not happen in Matthew. Quite apart from the christological theme of this passage, it can also be taken to infer that the mission is construed as an ongoing one to Israel, until it is superseded by the great commission.⁶⁹⁶

What does this suggest about the ministry of Matthew's church? It suggests first of all, that their ministry was primarily therapeutic. While they are charged to proclaim the approach of the kingdom, they are not enjoined to teach at all.⁶⁹⁷ Instead, the emphasis of the commissioning account is on healing and casting out demons. The fact that healing is twice mentioned in 10:1-8, and outlined in such detail, indicates that just as healing was a central component of Jesus' ministry, particularly to the crowds,

⁶⁹⁵ Schweizer, *Gemeinde*, 21. Burger, ("Taten", 287), sees in the miracle chapters themselves (8:1-9:34) an outline of the activity of the Church: "Matthäus bietet nicht einfach eine Sammlung von Wundertaten Jesu. Mit Hilfe überlieferter Taten und Worte Jesu umreißt er das Wunder der Kirche Christi."

⁶⁹⁶ Brown, "Mission", 79; Gnllka, *Matthäusevangelium* I 403.

⁶⁹⁷ This is a startling omission, and one which is not always recognized. For instance, Held remarks of the mission charge that "Jesus gives his disciples a share in his authority, as it is set out in Matt. 5-9", (*TIM* 250), yet this clearly does not include his teaching authority (7:29), unless, of course, teaching and preaching are regarded as identical. Why Matthew has chosen to omit teaching is not readily explained, and various possibilities present themselves: Meier has argued that it is used in the gospel's framework of salvation-history as an indication of *die Wende der Zeit* (Law 28#9). One might argue that passages like 1:21 have been interpreted by Matthew in a therapeutic light, and reflect the actual historical ministry of healing in which his community engaged, yet this still fails to explain why the community did not, at the outset, undertake a teaching ministry. Neither of these answers, however, is entirely satisfactory.

so too, is it a central component of Matthew's church's ministry. Even the recipients of Jesus' ministry have been adopted by the community. Such an inference will become more evident in the passages which follow.

3c. 9:8

It has already been shown that this passage ought to be regarded as applying to the community, and particularly to its authority to forgive sins. A more particular examination of its relation to the community requires, first of all, an examination of the genre of the pericope in which it appears. Is it a miracle story or *Streitgespräche*? Held, in his discussion of the passage, has argued that Matthew's attenuation and reshaping of the account demonstrates that it "is not so much concerned with the miracle itself as with the controversial question about the forgiveness of sins with which it deals."⁶⁹⁸ J.P. Heil, on the other hand, has protested against the subordination of the healing account to the controversy dialogue. He appeals to the "literary genre" of the miracle story, and argues that "however 'controversial' the story may be, it is, nevertheless, presented by Matthew as a miracle".⁶⁹⁹ Heil's use of the word "nevertheless" is expressive. There is no doubt that it is a miracle story,⁷⁰⁰ in which the elements of healing and forgiveness are indissolubly linked.⁷⁰¹ In its presentation however, the details of the story have been suppressed to provide a setting for the message about forgiveness. It is transformed from being a single healing account to something more paradigmatic,⁷⁰² a discussion of authority. As the authority it discussed was, in all likelihood, that possessed by the community, it can be seen that Matthew's major concern is with the controversy dialogue.

Assuming that the forgiveness of sins is the focus of Matthew's version, what does this passage say about the post-Easter community? For one, it makes explicit that

⁶⁹⁸ Held, *TIM*, 177.

⁶⁹⁹ Heil, "Aspects", 278.

⁷⁰⁰ Bultmann, *HST* 14f. suggests that it began in Mk as a miracle story into which a discussion was interpolated.

⁷⁰¹ Léon-Dufour, ("Structure et Fonction du récit de miracle" in *idem*, *Miracles*, 312) says "il n'y a qu'une seule action sur deux registres différents."

⁷⁰² The word is that of C. Burger "Taten" 280.

Matthew's community possessed the ἐξουσία to forgive sins, and that they put it into practice. This capacity to forgive sins was evidently used in conjunction with their healing ministry, since the account implies that their ability to forgive sins was ratified by their ability to heal. Yet did this healing actually transpire within the confines of the community, or beyond it? Sand has suggested that the crowds ought to be understood in this context as a transparency for community members.⁷⁰³ In this respect, the exercise of authority would be congruent with that of 18:18 in particular, which was *intra muros*.

Such a supposition hardly helps to explain why Matthew has refashioned the passage in the manner just described. Why has he stressed the controversial aspect of the account? While there was certainly discord within the community, as chapter 18 attests, the one thing they would be agreed upon is their authority to forgive sins. It is consonant with the ἐξουσία Jesus imparted to them at the beginning of their mission (10:1 cf. 1:21) and is indeed a Matthean component of the Lord's Supper, where Jesus' blood is poured out "for the forgiveness of sins" (26:28). Matthew's choice of genre only makes sense when it is regarded as an issue that is taking place *extra muros*. Matthew's community, in exerting its ability to forgive sins, is encountering conflict from the scribes.⁷⁰⁴ Gerhardsson suggests (of Jesus) that the point of contention was that he healed "unconditionally, without demanding confession of sins, repentance, and penance".⁷⁰⁵ If this is the case, it may well apply to the community, although conflict would be a natural response from an elite group such as the scribes, when suddenly faced with interlopers who possessed an authority they were so obviously lacking (cf. 7:29).⁷⁰⁶

If this assessment is correct, the passage marks an intriguing intermediate point with respect to the community. The commission they receive from Jesus is concerned primarily with healing and proclamation. The obverse side of the healing, the

⁷⁰³ Sand, *Gesetz*, 67.

⁷⁰⁴ "Die Praxis der Sündenvergebung mag von der Synagoge kritisiert worden sein" Gnlika, *Matthäusevangelium*, I 328.

⁷⁰⁵ Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 77.

⁷⁰⁶ Sanders (*Law* 61) rightly points out that the scribes never openly express themselves.

forgiveness of sins, represents, as Bornkamm has shown, activity which appears to be confined to the community.⁷⁰⁷ Apart from 1:2, which itself would be taken as programmatic for the community, this is the one passage where the community's capacity to forgive is extended to the crowds. This is doubly suggestive. On the one hand, it is expressive of a transformation within the church itself, where, over the course of its history, the ἐξουσία to heal, becomes transmuted into the authority to "bind and loose". It is not without significance that the final commission has nothing to say about healing.⁷⁰⁸ On the other hand, it intimates an early involvement with the community on the part of the crowds. The crowds not only recognize the community's forgiveness, they praise God for it, and implicit within this response is a participation in such forgiveness.

3d. 9:32-34; 12:22-24

Two more pericopae which point to the therapeutic activity of Matthew's community are the exorcisms at 9:32-34 and 12:22-24. Several features point to their having a post-Easter purview. The explicit mention of the Pharisees as Jesus' antagonists is noteworthy, since it is typical of Matthew's redaction, and they are not mentioned by either Mark or Luke (Mk 3:22 "the scribes from Jerusalem" Lk 11:15 "some of them"). Just as significant is Matthew 10:25b - "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebul, how much more will they malign those of his household".⁷⁰⁹ Apart from the mention of Beelzebul here, the only time where Jesus is associated with Beelzebul is in the above two passages (prince of demons 9:34, Beelzebul 12:24, cf. 12:27).⁷¹⁰ If the disciples, therefore, are being maligned like

⁷⁰⁷ "The congregation which acts in Matt. 18:15-18 knows itself as founded on the teaching of Jesus as guaranteed through Peter. The content and the lineaments of the "Rule for the Congregation" are, therefore, the outcome of that teaching." G. Bornkamm, "The Authority to 'Bind' and 'Loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 85-97.

⁷⁰⁸ If indeed, as I hope to argue, the community experiences a crisis with respect to its ability to heal, the kind of authority described at 16:19 and 18:18 would represent a retrenchment on their part, with authority to forgive, albeit in the community context, taking the place of healing.

⁷⁰⁹ This is Matthew's addition; cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 195. Bultmann, *HST* 90 holds that it is either Matthean or an independent saying he has incorporated.

⁷¹⁰ Strictly speaking, neither of these passages calls Jesus Beelzebul, but accuse him of performing the exorcisms "by (ἐν) Beelzebul".

Jesus, the clear implication is that they are being maligned for undertaking the same activities - namely exorcisms or healings.⁷¹¹

This being so, the doublet is suggestive in a number of respects. Matthew's addition of the Pharisees, the transformation of these two passages into *Streitgespräche*, and the reformulation of the crowds' responses into direct speech, all suggest one thing - namely, that Matthew is here dealing with the central preoccupations of his community. The first of these, centres on the legitimacy of his church's therapeutic activity. That he has their therapeutic activity as a whole in view, is made evident by his use of *θεραπεύω* at 12:22 for what is manifestly an exorcism (vs.9:33).⁷¹² The legitimacy of the community's ability to heal is impugned, not once, but twice, by the Pharisees, indicating a concerted effort on the part of the Pharisees to discredit the activity of Matthew's church. It is noteworthy that there is no questioning the efficacy of the healings themselves, merely, the power by which they were accomplished. The response of the community, is to align itself with Jesus, and to attribute its actions, as he does his, to the Holy Spirit (12:28,31).⁷¹³

Matthew's second concern in these passages is christological, as can be seen from his transformation of the second member of his doublet into a christological controversy between the community, the crowds and the Pharisees. Confronted with the undoubted therapeutic ability of Matthew's community, the crowds are brought to the point of considering the church's messianic claims about Jesus.⁷¹⁴ As Hummel germanely remarks, "Diese Exposition erweckt den Eindruck, daß in der Auseinandersetzung des Matthäus mit dem Judentum über die Messianität Jesu die Wunder eine wichtige Rolle spielten".⁷¹⁵ The *μήτι* may well be expressive of the fact that the type of Messiah being proclaimed by the community, was contrary to the

⁷¹¹ Luz, "Disciples", 108; Schweizer, "Church", 132.

⁷¹² This is consonant with the general depiction of Jesus - "Matthew alters the picture of Jesus as an exorcist to a broader picture of Jesus as the healer of Israel" (Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 80).

⁷¹³ *Ibid.*, 74. For a helpful analysis of Jesus' reply to the Pharisees, see Cope, *Scribe*, 36-40.

⁷¹⁴ While the *οὗτος* is certainly deictic here, one wonders whether it might not also be taken to refer allusively to the Jesus of proclamation cf. Acts 2:32,36.

⁷¹⁵ Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 123.

typical expectation associated with the Son of David.⁷¹⁶ If the crowds had indeed been expecting a political ruler, a king of David's line, the community's message about a therapeutic Son of David who had been crucified, would hardly evoke the messianic figure they had anticipated. The Pharisees typically, attempt to quell such deliberations on the crowds' part, by again attributing the church's therapeutic ability to demonic forces.

The crowds, however, emerge as being particularly responsive to healings. As was noted earlier, their response shifts from a concern with the healing activity as such, to the healer. And even though the Pharisees attempt to suppress their surmises about the Son of David, their acclamation at 21:9 reflects a more widespread acceptance of the therapeutic Son of David on the part of the crowds,⁷¹⁷ if, indeed, this verse is not governed by tradition or apologetic concerns.

On the basis of the foregoing passages, it is evident that Matthew's community was exercising its ἐξουσία within the confines of Israel, and provoking two sorts of reaction - antipathy from the Pharisees and scribes, and astonishment from the crowds. When the former are confronted with the church's therapeutic activity, they react with virulence, and attempt to discredit both the community's ability to heal and its claims about the Messiah and the forgiveness of sins. It is surely noteworthy here, that the crowds are more closely aligned with the stance of the community. While the Jewish leaders are unremitting in their rejection of the church's activity, the crowds remain remarkably open. Their responses rightly attribute the church's activity to God (9:8), recognize that it is unprecedented (9:33), and see in it intimations of the Messiah (12:23).

That the crowds are so open to the church's message, may help to explain the

⁷¹⁶ "Matthew's extended use of the title in the late first century is connected to - but contrasted with - current Jewish usage" (Duling, "Promises" 69; cf. Geist, *Menschensohn* 378). Certainly the picture which emerges from the 17th Psalm of Solomon is more consonant with the biblical promises to David, as is the 15th petition of the Babylonian recension of the *Shemoneh 'Esreh* "Cause the shoot of David to shoot forth quickly, and raise up his horn by thy salvation..." (cited in Schürer, *History*, 458). Here the horn is symbolic of political power, and in particular, the power to end Israel's subjugation to the gentiles (cf. Foerster, "κέρας" *TDNT* III 669-71, 670). Thus, a political messiah is in view.

⁷¹⁷ It is possible that they also looked upon Jesus as a prophet in the mold of Elija or Elisha.

vehemence of the Jewish leaders' opposition. Gerhardsson observes that, in Matthew, "the adversaries only play a small, casual role in the texts on Jesus' miracles....they are not even mentioned in the summaries nor in the narratives of the non-therapeutic miracles. And as for the fourteen pericopes of the therapeutic miracles, the adversaries are only mentioned in four of these."⁷¹⁸ It is certainly noteworthy then, that three of these four therapeutic miracles contain favorable reactions on the part of the crowds.⁷¹⁹ There is only one occasion, moreover, where the crowds respond to Jesus' healing activity when the Jewish leaders are absent (15:31). In general, the responses of the crowds and Jewish leaders are grouped together, and the reactions of the scribes and Pharisees are calculated to discredit the church, presumably, in order to maintain their own influence over the crowds.⁷²⁰ What this suggests is an incipient movement on the part of the Pharisees to undermine the position of the early community. Although they cannot refute the therapeutic activity of the church amongst the crowds, they can do their best to discredit it. Yet the crowds' continued and enthusiastic response to the church's healings indicates a basic receptiveness on their parts to this kind of activity, and an indifference toward the Jewish leaders.

For this reason, the crowds' reactions of amazement and astonishment in the face of Jesus' healings can also be taken to typify their response to the community in the course of its healing ministry. Here too, their astonishment and praise of God would suggest a certain openness to faith, which, as yet, falls short of it.

This is also the case with the following which is attributed to the crowds. Since this was determined to be a response to Jesus' ability to heal, it is likely that these occurrences of ἀκολουθέω can also be taken as a response to the therapeutic activity of the community. It would help to explain why the references to the crowds'

⁷¹⁸ Gerhardsson, *Mighty*, 79. Italics removed from his first sentence.

⁷¹⁹ The one miracle where the crowds do not figure is the healing on the sabbath 12:9-14 // Mk 3:1-6 // Lk 6:6-11.

⁷²⁰ Sanders (*Law*, 240) holds that the Pharisees "seem to have had a very appreciable public following and to have been admired and respected". This is, in all likelihood, true, although Sanders does not justify his view here. Oppenheimer (*Am Ha-Aretz*, 159-60) similarly argues for cordial relations between the Pharisees and the *am ha-aretz*, but he only adduces one text, which does not, of itself, support the weight he places on it. The reasons for the Jewish leaders' antipathy to the community will be dealt with below.

following are so profuse in the gospel, since they are almost too abundant to be explained purely on christological grounds. If they are taken to characterize the ministry of the church as well as that of Jesus, the picture they convey, is of a widespread popular movement which was associated with the healing activity of Matthew's church. Once again, this would not be the crowds' sole reason for becoming attached to the community - the church's message would certainly be another factor, but nevertheless healing would have an undeniable importance.

That the church's ministry attracted a considerable following can also be inferred from the feeding narratives. Matthew is dependent on Mark, but in both feeding accounts he has increased the number of those fed. At Mark 8:9 the ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι becomes τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων at 15:38. So too, at Mark 6:44 where πεντασχίλιοι ἄνδρες are transmuted into "five thousand men besides women and children". These changes might be ascribed entirely to Matthew's christological emphasis, yet they are, nevertheless, highly evocative.⁷²¹

This is because these crowds reflect the post-Easter situation. Held has effectively shown how the disciples act as mediators for Jesus.⁷²² In two highly formalized statements, Matthew has Jesus give to the disciples and the disciples to the crowds. This singles out the disciples as exemplars for the crowds, and at the same time, demonstrates their privileged status. Yet it suggests more than this. Here the crowds have no direct dealings with Jesus. It is only the disciples who have contact with him, and only they who are able to pass on the results of his miraculous activity to the crowds. Such a set of circumstances reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of Matthew's church, and indeed, gives a programmatic sense to Jesus' charge "You give them

⁷²¹ It is noteworthy that in Acts, for instance, the new christian believers are also numbered in the thousands: 3,000 at Ac 2:41 and 5,000 at Ac 4:4. The latter figure, as in Matthew, refers only to the males ([ὁ] ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἀνδρῶν). Of course, the crowds in Matthew are not adherents, but followers. Haenchen (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* tr. B. Noble et al (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971) is right in seeing these numbers as symbolic instead of statistical (215#2), though he fails to substantiate his assumption that the early christian community lived a "quiet", "modest" existence (188).

⁷²² Held, (*TIM*, 187) notes that this role "is markedly developed only by the first evangelist".

something to eat." (14:16b). Jesus is gone, and the community is the sole mediator of Jesus' compassion. The numbers noted above indicate just how effective their mediation was.⁷²³ Even if they are regarded as symbolic, the community's therapeutic ministry must have been very successful indeed.

What is striking about this scenario, is that it is remarkably similar in theme, if not specific detail, to the picture of the early Christian community in Jerusalem furnished by Acts. In chapter 3 Peter and John are described as going up to the temple where they heal a man lame from birth. All the people react with wonder and amazement (Ac 3:10), and in the face of their astonishment Peter preaches to them, attributing the man's perfect health to faith in Jesus. Peter and John are then arrested by the priests, the Captain of the Temple, and the Sadducees, who were annoyed "because they were teaching the people and proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection of the dead" (Ac 4:2).

Here we see a parallel pattern of 1) healing 2) astonishment by the people 3) teaching by the church 4) opposition by the Jewish leaders.⁷²⁴ In each account, it is therapeutic activity which produces converts and followers. This is made evident by Luke on several occasions, most explicitly at 5:12-14: "Now many signs and wonders were done among the people by the hands of the apostles...And more than ever believers were added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women, so that they even carried out the sick into the streets..." (Ac 5:12-15, cf. 16).⁷²⁵ Here there is such a close connection made between the two, that he has actually sandwiched the conversion pericope in between two healing accounts. The reason for this, is

⁷²³ This again raises the question of the crowds as converts. Given the eucharistic imagery in these pericopae, would not this be more likely? While it certainly is possible that some members of the crowds joined Matthew's church, the crowds ought not to be seen as converts. Like the crowds of Jesus' day, they come to the community because of their need. That this is Matthew's perspective is implied by the interpretation of the parable of the sower, a passage which appears to set out his understanding of the divine economy operative within his church. As was demonstrated above, the crowds are associated with the seed sown on the path, where the evil one comes and snatches away what is sown in their hearts (13:4,19). So even if the crowds do become attached to Matthew's community at one point, it would have to be regarded as a particularly tenuous attachment - in the parable, the seeds do not even take root.

⁷²⁴ Conzelmann, (*Acts of the Apostles, Hermeneia* tr. J. Limburg et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 25) finds a different pattern.

⁷²⁵ For a discussion of the difficulties in this passage, see Haenchen, *Acts*, 244-5.

probably, as Achtemeier has noted, that "Luke appears to have a more unambiguous reliance on the possibility that miracles, and thus miracle stories, can serve as the basis for faith in Jesus."⁷²⁶ In Luke, therapeutic miracles serve as the platform for the preaching of the community.⁷²⁷

A related set of circumstances appears to apply to Matthew's community. The members of Matthew's church were performing miraculous healings, with the result that multitudes are following them as well. Their proclamation about Jesus, Son of David is probably not too different in emphasis from Luke's kerygma, which speaks of Jesus of Nazareth who was attested by God through "mighty works and wonders and signs" (Ac 2:22). The only major difference which seems to exist, is that Luke speaks of converts, while Matthew speaks of large crowds which have attached themselves to his community. The references to these crowds in the feeding narratives are probably too vague to stipulate the nature of this attachment, apart from the fact that the group is extensive.⁷²⁸ Thus, in Matthew's view, the therapeutic miracles are sufficient to attract nonbelievers, but not always sufficient to convert them.

Both communities also experience opposition as a direct result of their miraculous activity. The leaders in both instances appear to recognize the effect that healings have on the people at large, and take steps to counteract it. The Sadducees in Acts simply attempt to suppress news about it: "in order that it may spread no further among the people, let us warn them to speak no more to anyone in this name." (Ac 4:17). What makes this account different from Matthew's (apart from their being Sadducees) is that they recognize the healing as something good ("seeing the man that had been healed standing beside them, they had nothing to say in opposition", Ac 4:14) and have no wish to oppose God (cf. Ac 5:39). Even the Pharisees in John's episode

⁷²⁶ Paul J. Achtemeier, "The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch" in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978)153-67, 165. He is speaking of Luke's gospel, but also includes Acts within the discussion.

⁷²⁷ This is well brought out by R. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A Literary Interpretation* Vol. II (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 48-79.

⁷²⁸ It is also uncertain whether Matthew's community is settled like the Christians in Jerusalem, or whether it is itinerant, as Schweizer, "Observance", has argued. The latter possibility seems most likely, at least for the early history of the community.

of the man born blind are prepared to recognize the goodness implicit in Jesus' sign: "Give God the praise; we know that this man is a sinner" (Jn 9:24 cf. 9:16).⁷²⁹ Matthew's Pharisees, by contrast, are prepared to make no such concession. For them, the miracles performed by the community are tainted, because they have been done in concert with demonic powers. As such, they demand unqualified opposition, and certainly, Matthew's community, just like the emerging church in Acts, begins to experience persecution.

Conclusion

To sum up, the ministry of Matthew's church is explicitly modelled on the ministry of Jesus, with particular emphasis placed on healing and exorcism. That these last two features are vital for the community can be ascertained from 9:8, which indicates that the church's authority to forgive sins is, in some measure, bound up with its capability to heal. Its therapeutic ministry also served to legitimize its messianic claims, particularly concerning the therapeutic Son of David. Not surprisingly, their ministry and their claims elicit significant opposition from the Jewish authorities. One of the reasons for this, is the extreme popularity of the community with the crowds. The ὄχλοι are amazed at the church's healings, a fact which leads them to consider the messianic claims made by the Matthean community. In the meanwhile, they attach themselves to the community in large numbers, enthralled at the unquestioned authority of the church.

4. PERSECUTION

4a. *Discussion*

The clearest instances of persecution are mentioned in the mission discourse,

⁷²⁹ For a discussion of this episode in the context of John's community, see Martyn, *Theology*, 37-62.

discourse, particularly 10:17-25. This segment of the discourse follows immediately upon the explicit commissioning outlined at 10:1-16, and is largely comprised of elements from Mark's "little apocalypse".⁷³⁰ Matthew has made some significant changes to his source. For instance, at 10:17 he has added αὐτῶν to Mark's συναγωγᾷς (Mk 13:9). The effect of this addition, as Hare notes, is that, unlike Mark, it "requires that we understand the subject of *both* verbs ('deliver' as well as 'flog') to be members of the synagogues, i.e. Jews."⁷³¹ Thus the members of Matthew's community run afoul of members of the synagogue during their mission activities.

The αὐτῶν also intimates, as was argued above, that the Christian synagogues are now separate from their those of their Jewish counterparts. This split, however, would seemingly reflect a period later from the one being described here, since corporal punishment within the synagogues indicates that the missionaries are still under the religious jurisdiction of the Jewish synagogues.⁷³² Does this rift suggest that the members of Matthew's community have subsequently been excluded from the synagogues? Or, to put it another way, has the *Birkath ha-Minim* been instituted to bring about this separation? The only appropriate answer is to say that we do not have enough evidence to make a reasonable judgement. In the first place, Matthew, unlike John (9:22; 12:42; 16:2),⁷³³ gives no indication of the factors underlying the actual separation of his community from the synagogue. In the second place, too little is known about the benediction and its relationship to Christianity to admit of certainty. Horbury is probably correct when he relates that "the wording of the benediction was variable, and no surviving text can be assumed to reproduce a specimen...of the

⁷³⁰ Mk 13:9-13 cp. Lk 21:12-19 cf. Bultmann, *HST* 122.

⁷³¹ Hare, *Persecution*, 102.

⁷³² *Ibid.*, 105. It is not indicated by the Mishnah where the punishment was administered; the references to punishment within the synagogue are all from the New Testament. cf. Schürer, *History*, II 447. Luz (*Matthew* 1-7, 242) also sees Jewish persecution as a feature of the past.

⁷³³ See Martyn, *History*, 37-62, for his reconstruction of the split between the Johannine community and the synagogue, as well as John T. Townsend, "The Gospel of John and the Jews: The Story of a Religious Divorce" in Alan T. Davies (ed.) *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*, (New York: Paulist Press, 1979) 72-97, 84-88.

Jamnian prayer".⁷³⁴ Thus, it remains uncertain whether the *Notzrim* were actually mentioned in the benediction composed by Samuel the Small, or were introduced into the *berakhah* later, possibly after the defeat of Bar Koziba.⁷³⁵ Allied to this, is the question of the actual identity of the *minim*, a problem which, itself, shows little sign of being resolved.⁷³⁶ All these factors, therefore, argue against relying too strongly on the benediction as a barometer of Jewish - Christian relations at the end of the first century.

At 10:17, Matthew again gives intimations of Jewish persecution by his change of Mark's *δαρήσεσθε* to *μαστιγώσουσιν*. The latter is a usage which Schneider identifies as a *terminus technicus* for the flogging imposed by a council of three judges.⁷³⁷ As the *Mishnah* relates, "How many stripes do they inflict on a man? Forty save one, for it is written, *By number forty*; (that is to say,) a number near to forty."⁷³⁸ Yet if Matthew (following Mark) is suggesting that the missionaries would be flogged, it is not clear from the *Mishnah*, at least, why this would be so. According to Hare, the *Mishnah* "provides no legal support for the suppression of heresy by the application of corporal punishment."⁷³⁹ The only rationale which he can supply is to suggest that active missionaries, like Paul, were flogged for committing breaches of the peace (e.g. Ac 18:5-8).⁷⁴⁰ This might suggest that Matthew's community was experiencing

⁷³⁴ William Horbury, "The Benediction of the *Minim* and early Jewish-Christian controversy" *JTS* 33 (1982) 19-61, 59, cf. Sanders, *Law*, 250 and Schürer, *History*, II 462.

⁷³⁵ See b Ber 28b-29a. For a discussion of this question see Steven T. Katz, "Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C. E.: A Reconsideration" *JBL* 103 (1984) 43-76, 64-69, and Reuven Kimelman "Birkath ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity" in E. P. Sanders et al. (eds.) *Jewish and Christian Self Definition* II (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 226-244, 232-40. Their case against seeing it as original relies too much on arguments *e silentio* to be satisfactory. For an opposing view, see Davies, *SSM*, 276f..

⁷³⁶ See Katz, "Issues", 69-74, who gives an overview of the state of the question.

⁷³⁷ Carl Schneider, "μαστιγώω κτλ" *TDNT* IV 515-19, 516. Cf. Sanh.1:2.

⁷³⁸ Danby, *Mishnah*, Makk 3:10. The third chapter of Makkoth outlines both those who are liable to flogging (1-9) and how the procedure is carried out (10-14).

⁷³⁹ Hare, *Persecution*, 44.

⁷⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 46. He urges that this does not represent a "determined effort" by the Jews to suppress Christianity. He also refers to an intriguing citation from b Sanh 46a "It has been taught: R. Eliezer b. Jacob said: I have heard that the Beth din may, (when necessary,) impose flagellation and pronounce (capital) sentences even where not (warranted) by the Torah; yet not with the intention of disregarding the Torah but (on the contrary) to safeguard it. It once happened that a man rode a horse on the Sabbath in the Greek period and he was brought before the Court and stoned, not because he was liable thereto, but because it was (practically) required by the times. Again it happened that a man once had intercourse with his wife under a fig tree. He was brought before the Beth din and flogged, not because he merited it, but because the times required it." Hare is certainly correct when he

difficulties of a similar nature.⁷⁴¹ That Matthew again adverts to flogging in the anti-Pharisaic discourse (23:34) argues that this is more than simply a literary motif he has adopted from Mark.

The most vivid feature of Matthew's reformulation of Mark's passage is its location. Matthew has moved it from an apocalyptic situation where it is descriptive of future tribulations, to a context where it is used to typify the kind of reception the apostles were to expect. And since Matthew is redacting this passage *post facto*, it ought to be taken as an encapsulation of the results of the mission. The most salient feature that emerges is that the apostles were persecuted. The passage is not clear about the identity of the persecutors, but both the beatitudes and the anti-Pharisaic discourse indicate that it was the Pharisees and the scribes.

Why is it then, that Matthew's community was persecuted? One likely answer is provided by Hare, who suggests that the reason for their persecution was some sort of breach of the peace on the part of the missionaries. Yet what sort of breach of the peace would this be? The answer appears to be contained in the beginning of the discourse. It is apparent from the considerable emphasis placed on the apostles' authority to heal and cast out demons that it is to be interpreted as a vital, even primary, component of the apostles' ministry. If this healing resulted in the same sort of amazement on the part of the crowds with which it was greeted in the above passages, it may well have provoked rancour on the part of the local officials.⁷⁴²

advocates caution in interpreting this passage. Nevertheless, it might represent a legitimate reminiscence of a time when there was *de facto* flexibility in the judicial system, even if this flexibility was not *de jure*. Alan Segal (*Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986) 151) argues that the charges against Paul "suggest that the rabbinic movement had not yet had a significant effect on the synagogue's behaviour."

⁷⁴¹ It might also suggest that the Mishnah does not entirely reflect the pre 70 situation, or alternately, that Matthew is merely describing anticipated persecution. The former is more likely.

⁷⁴² It is just possible that there are echoes of this sort of policy in the Tosefta. Consider the following cases furnished by R. Travers Herford, (*Christianity in Talmud and Midrash* (Clifton: Reference Book publishers, 1966) 103) "The case of R. El'azar ben Damah, whom a serpent bit. There came in Jacob, a man of Chepar Sama, to cure him in the name of Jeshua' ben Pandira, but R. Ishmael did not allow it. He said "Thou art not permitted, Ben Damah." He said, "I will bring thee a proof that he may heal me." But he had not finished bringing a proof when he died. R. Ishmael said, "Happy art thou Ben Damah, for thou hast departed in peace, and hast not broken through the ordinances of the wise; for upon every one who breaks through the fence of the wise, punishment comes at last, as it is written (Eccl x.8): Whoso breaketh a fence a serpent shall bite him." Hull ii 22-23 103. The serpent bite in this account fits rather too nicely with the moral from Eccl, and is probably not a genuine reminiscence. Nevertheless it appears to intimate something of a settled policy

Persecution could also be attributed to several other factors. It may have stemmed from the Pharisees' and scribes' concern that the crowds not be perverted by an erroneous understanding of the law and its requirements. This "erroneous understanding" would likely have meant that the community was flouting the Pharisees' interpretation of the law, and not simply the Pharisaic παράδοσις, since, if Sanders is right, the Pharisees were not adamant about imposing their traditions on others: "Presumably they would have liked it if more people emulated them. But on practices which they knew to be unbiblical, they did not think that theirs was the only view and that those who did not agree were transgressing the revealed word of God."⁷⁴³

A third possibility is that Jesus, because of his healing activity, may have already been branded as a γόης. Matthew is alone among the gospels in having the Pharisees describe Jesus as ἐκεῖνος ὁ πλάνος,⁷⁴⁴ nor is the accusation that he is in collusion with Beelzebul far removed from the charge that he is a magician.⁷⁴⁵ Certainly, by the time of Justin Martyr, the Jews appear to have attributed his healing ability to his being a magician: Jesus "healed those who from birth were blind and deaf and lame. He cured them by His word, causing them to walk, to hear, and to see. By restoring the dead to life, He compelled the men of that day to recognize Him. Yet though they witnessed these miraculous deeds with their own eyes, they attributed them to magical art; indeed, and they dared to call him a magician who misled the people".⁷⁴⁶ A related charge is found in the Babylonian Talmud: "He who sins and causes the multitude to sin is not afforded the means of repentance." In the uncensored edition of the Talmud this is immediately followed by: "And a master has said, 'Jesus

with respect to healing by Christians. Cf. Hull ii 20,21.

⁷⁴³ Sanders, *Law*, 250.

⁷⁴⁴ cf. Jn 7:12 where some members of the crowds say of Jesus: "...he is leading the people (τὸν ὄχλον) astray". Matthew's gospel also eliminates those features of Mark which might make Jesus look like a magician. His very care to eliminate these features, might suggest that he had reasons, apart from his christology for doing so.

⁷⁴⁵ According to C.K. Barrett (*The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*, (London: SPCK, 1947) 61) Jesus' healing techniques were similar to those of magicians. Morton Smith's (*Jesus the Magician*, (New York: Harper, 1978) 31ff.) views on this question are intriguing, if overstated.

⁷⁴⁶ Dial 69 in *The Fathers of the Church. Writings of Saint Justin Martyr*, tr. T. B. Falls (New York: Christian Heritage, 1948).

the Nazarene practised magic and led Israel astray" (San 107b).

Since the community was invested with Jesus' authority, it too, on the principle of 10:25, would incur the same opprobrium. In fact, it would experience more. Their ability to heal and cast out demons might help to account for the unrelieved opposition of the Pharisees to the church which was described above. If the Pharisees were convinced that Jesus was a magician, and that the disciples were performing demonic healings in his name, it would do much to explain their antipathy. Such a state of affairs would explain their concern that the crowds not come under the church's influence, and also suggest why the Pharisees are so often described as being present with the crowds when the church performs its healings.⁷⁴⁷ They intervene to prevent the crowds from being led astray and deceived by the church's magical therapeutic practices.

J. L. Martyn has developed an intriguing line of argument on the basis of John 7, which suggests that Jewish authorities attempted to halt Christian missionaries by trying them and then stoning them on the basis of Deut 13:6ff., as people who lead others astray (πλάνοι).⁷⁴⁸ If his argument is valid, it is not unlikely that Matthew's community also experienced a similar sort of organized opposition, although it would probably have been in a more nascent state. It would, nevertheless, have been threatening enough for Matthew's community to take it very seriously indeed.

Conclusion

That Matthew's church experienced persecution is evident from his recasting of Mark's little apocalypse into part of his own mission discourse. His redactional changes indicate that it was administered by Jews. While there does not appear to be enough evidence to comment on the *Birkath ha Minim*, it is possible that local authorities acted independently to counteract the Christians. The latter may have been charged for breaches of the peace, but it seems more likely that they were brought up

⁷⁴⁷ According to Lachs, in Jewish literature, Jesus' "disciples and those who followed them are best known through their healing activity in the name of Jesus." *Rabbinic*, 178.

⁷⁴⁸ Martyn, *History*, 81ff..

on charges of misleading the people.

5 DOUBT IN THE COMMUNITY

If the community was experiencing trouble from persecution *extra muros*, it was also experiencing trouble from within, in the form of little faith or doubt. This is a motif which runs through a number of pericopae, and seems to indicate that the community was undergoing a crisis of doubt. Just why this would afflict Matthew's church is difficult to say, but it is not impossible that it is related to persecution.

5a *The Healing of the Epileptic*

The most decisive example of the disciples' failure to exercise the mandate that they have from Jesus is the pericope of the Healing of the Epileptic (Mt. 17:14-21). As Held and Aichinger have shown,⁷⁴⁹ Matthew has made extensive alterations to Mark's account.⁷⁵⁰ The most significant of these changes is his elimination of most of the details of Mark's story so as to highlight the failure of the disciples. As Held observes, this has become the sole theme of the story,⁷⁵¹ and is made emphatic through the thrice-repeated reference to the disciples' incapacity. The account opens with the epileptic's father relating that the disciples "could not heal" his son (οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι 17:16). Later, when the disciples ask Jesus why they could not cast it out (διὰ τί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό 17:19), he tells them if they had faith as a grain of mustard seed, nothing would be impossible for them (καὶ οὐδὲν ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν 17:20). The focus of the pericope, therefore, is on their inability to perform miracles, and the instruction about faith which they are given afterward.⁷⁵²

⁷⁴⁹ For a discussion of the redaction of this passage and its Matthean characteristics, see Held *TIM*, 187-92; Hermann Aichinger, "Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Epileptiker - Perikope Mk, 14 - 29 par Mt 17, 14 - 21 par Lk 9, 37 - 43a", in A. Fuchs (hrsg.), *Probleme Der Forschung*, (München: Verlag Harold Wien, 1978), 114 - 143.

⁷⁵⁰ Held, *TIM*, 189-190, alludes to the possibility that Mark's text here may have been expanded, since Luke's account, which usually retains the longer Markan text, does not have it here. Held notes, however, that even if that is the case, Matthew's alterations are still significant. On the elimination of the magical features from this account see Otto Böcher, "Matthäus und die Magie" in Schenke, *Studien*, 11-24, 17.

⁷⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 188.

⁷⁵² That this instruction is important for Matthew can be adjudged from the fact that the material given here replicates much of the pericope of the cursing of the fig tree (21:20-22//Mk 11:20-

This account is best taken as referring to the community.⁷⁵³ Jesus and the "pillars" of the early church are no longer around; they are on the mountain of transfiguration. As the transfiguration is often acknowledged to have close associations with the resurrection accounts,⁷⁵⁴ this offers a suggestive correlation. Matthew's church no longer has Jesus or the first disciples to guide it. It has been left on its own, though it continues to adhere to the mission directives of chapter 10. In particular, it has continued to perform healings and exorcisms within the context of the crowds. While Matthew makes the connection of the epileptic's father with the crowds less explicit than Mark,⁷⁵⁵ it is, nevertheless, evident that the crowds continue to provide the forum for the community's healing ministry.

Yet, as Matthew indicates, this ministry is in crisis. Jesus' reproach "O faithless and perverse generation..." ought to be taken as a reference to the community. That its therapeutic ministry as a whole is in doubt, and not merely a single exorcism, can be inferred from Matthew's substitution of *θεραπεύσαι* for Mark's *ἐκβάλλω* at 17:16.⁷⁵⁶ It is only after the epileptic's father has outlined the problem besetting the community, that the account even mentions the casting out of demons (17:18,19).

The pericope which Matthew has appended to his healing narrative is designed to remedy this problem. The church turns to Jesus, uncertain about why they are now bereft of their healing power. Jesus' answer stresses their lack of faith and what they would be able to accomplish if they had it. But whether the church will heed his call to faith remains in contention. The use of the subjunctive in the conditional clause at

26). It is perhaps worthy of remark, that even in this pericope, the disciples appear to be lacking in faith. Matthew relates that they marvelled (*ἐθαύμασαν* 21:20 no //) at the withering of the fig tree. Since he does not ordinarily impute such a reaction to the disciples (rather, to the crowds, 9:33;15:31; cf.22:22), this could suggest *ὀλιγοπιστία* on their parts.

⁷⁵³ Held, *TIM*, 271-72, Aichinger, "Epileptiker- Perikope", 136; Luz, "Disciples", 108; Hill, *Matthew*, 270, "perhaps" and so, too, Beare, *Matthew*, 369.

⁷⁵⁴ Schweizer, *Matthew* 227-28, Donaldson, (*Mountain* 138) offers a discussion of the views which hold that the transfiguration account was originally a resurrection appearance.

⁷⁵⁵ This can be attributed to Matthew's abbreviation of Mark's healing account, in which he has pared Mark's three references to the crowd (Mk 9:14,15,16) down to one (17:14).

⁷⁵⁶ *ἐθεραπεύθη* (no //s) is used at 17:18 to demonstrate the efficacy of Jesus' ministry, in contrast to that of his disciples (17:16). While it is likely Matthew has introduced *προσήνεγκα* into his account because it is a favorite expression of his (15,3,4), it may also be intended to suggest an implicit contrast between Jesus' ability to heal, and that of his followers.

17:20 (ἔχητε) makes the outcome more doubtful than if the protasis were in the indicative. The remedy has been suggested; whether the church will be able to make use of it is a different matter. That is to say, it is by no means certain whether the community will ever be able to resume its therapeutic ministry among the crowds.

5b *Peter's Walking on the Water*

The walking on the water episode (14:22-33) furnishes a related example of a failure in δύνάμις on the part of the community. The whole account of Peter's walking on the water is clearly Matthean,⁷⁵⁷ and Peter himself functions here as a representative of the community as a whole.⁷⁵⁸ It is also evident that this passage is written with the post-resurrection community in mind. Bornkamm has incisively shown how, in the stilling of the storm pericope, the disciples in their boat are to be taken as "the little ship of the Church".⁷⁵⁹ The same holds true for the walking on the water pericope. Here many of the same elements repeat themselves. The disciples are again in a boat, and again faced with adverse conditions - the boat is many furlongs from the shore, the wind is against them and they are being beaten by the waves. More noteworthy still is Jesus' absence - a feature which obviously faced the post-Easter community. In the stilling of the storm pericope he is still with them, albeit asleep. Here he is not with them at all, but comes to them after bidding them to go ahead. The disciples do what he has enjoined and encounter difficulties once he has left them. Jesus finally returns to them, and it is perhaps not without significance that they regard him as a φάντασμα. The phrase μὴ φοβεῖσθε is only used elsewhere by Jesus in two Matthean passages - the appearance of the risen Jesus to the women (28:5) and in the transfiguration narrative (17:7). Similarly, the word διστάζω occurs only twice in

⁷⁵⁷ Held, *TIM*, 205; Gnllka *Matthäusevangelium* II 11f.; Goulder, *Midrash*, 378; Strecker (*Weg*, 198-99) argues for an underlying piece of oral tradition based on the analogy with John 21:7f., but his argument is hardly compelling.

⁷⁵⁸ See Kingsbury, "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem", *JBL* 98 (1979), 67-83, 72; Schweizer, "Church", 136; Strecker, *Weg*, 203-06. This, of course, does not obviate his status as spokesman or even as the symbolic leader of the community.

⁷⁵⁹ Bornkamm, "Stilling", *TIM*, 55.

Matthew (and the entire New Testament) once at 14:31 and once in Jesus' final appearance to his disciples.

As was noted earlier, Peter's initiative is made to originate with Jesus. While it is Peter who emerges with the idea of walking on the water, he immediately refers it to Jesus; "Lord, if it is you, bid me (κέλευσόν με) come to you on the water" (14:28). And Jesus does indeed command him to come - Ἐλθέ (14:29). Peter's use of κεύω and Jesus' own use of the imperative are noteworthy, since, as was seen above, κεύω is frequently associated with discipleship and its obligations.⁷⁶⁰ Here, as with the other calls to discipleship, the initiative rests with Jesus. Clearly, however, Jesus' command does more than merely summon Peter, it empowers him as well. Peter, in order to be able to walk to Jesus, must participate in Jesus' ἐξουσία. This is not to deny Peter his own initiative - the story obviously hinges on the fact that Peter's ability to do this rests on his own obedient faith. Yet he is, nevertheless, empowered by Jesus to do exactly what Jesus himself is doing. This whole scenario is redolent of the mission discourse, where the ἐξουσία given to the disciples enables them to perform the same types of healings and exorcisms that Jesus has performed.

Yet, as in the pericope of the epileptic, there is a crisis of faith. Peter's faith fails him when he sees the wind - he doubts and begins to sink, until Jesus rescues him. He, too, is reproached by Jesus for having little faith, "O man of little faith (ὀλιγόπιστε 14:31), why did you doubt?". Unlike the pericope of the epileptic, there are grounds given for Peter's doubt. He is fearful of the wind, which, as Matthew earlier reports, "was against them" (14:24). His fear, then, is different than their earlier fear of Jesus, which was a fear of the numinous (14:26), this is fear for his life: "Lord save me (κύριε, σῶσόν με 14:30). It is the same reaction that the disciples have earlier in the storm-stilling episode - fear for their own lives: "Save Lord - we are perishing - κύριε, σῶσον ἀπολλύμεθα. In each case it is greeted with the same response by Jesus - he accuses them of little faith. They respond by worshipping him.

⁷⁶⁰Held, *TIM*, "The whole scene of Peter walking on the sea...presents a disciple on the way to discipleship" (206).

Bornkamm describes the stilling of the storm episode in Matthew as a "kerygmatic paradigm of the danger and glory of discipleship".⁷⁶¹ By the same token, Matthew's interpolation of the Walking on the Water episode can also be taken as a paradigm of doubt and faith in discipleship. Yet, it is also amenable to a less idealized, and more allegorical understanding. Given the above correlation between the church and the boat, and Jesus on the water with the risen Jesus, the passage can be taken as a self-description of the community. The risen Jesus has called them to discipleship, and they have responded. By virtue of his ἐξουσία, they are able to embark on the ministry enjoined in the mission discourse, including thaumaturgical activities such as healing and the casting out of demons. After a while, however, they lose sight of Jesus, and begin to fear for their safety. This may indicate that the community was facing persecution. Matthew's report that the wind was "against them" is certainly suggestive of animosity, while flogging or capital punishment would quite naturally, bring them to fear for their lives.⁷⁶² Their failure to repose confidence in Jesus has provoked doubt. With doubt has come a falling off of their thaumaturgical ability. Though the account indicates that Jesus will rescue them, it says nothing about the restoration of their thaumaturgical ability.

Barth has argued differently. He holds that "Jesu Epiphanie hat hier also eine Nachgeschichte: sie befreit zum Glauben und führt zur Nachfolge."⁷⁶³ It is not at all clear that this is the case, as Matthew gives no indication of what happens next. It does seem odd, however, that the disciples are never once shown as triumphing over their doubt or little faith through their belief.

5c 28:18

The passage reads, "when they saw him they worshipped him, but some

⁷⁶¹ Bornkamm, *TIM*, 57.

⁷⁶² In the account of the storm stilling, Bornkamm interprets the storm in a variety of ways with reference to discipleship. It can designate "apocalyptic horrors" or "a symbol of the distresses involved in discipleship." (Bornkamm, *TIM*, 56).

⁷⁶³ Barth, "Glaube", 287.

doubted (οἱ δὲ ἐδίσταντο)". Although there is some controversy about whether the οἱ δὲ taken at the historical level, refers to the disciples. It is most likely that it does.⁷⁶⁴ If this is so, however, there is no indication that the appearance of the resurrected Jesus does "befreit zum Glauben". In fact, some, if not all, of the disciples are described as doubting, either when confronted with the Risen Lord, or even after worshipping Jesus. In either case, Jesus' appearance can hardly be said to allay their doubt.

Barth would again wish to argue that Jesus assuages their doubt at 28:17 as well. He holds that because in Mk 16:14 and Luke 24:37-42 it is left for the reader to conclude that the disciples overcame their doubt, this must also be the case here.⁷⁶⁵ This is scarcely a legitimate inference. Even if his assumption about Mark and Luke is true (and it may not be), there is no reason to suppose it need apply to Matthew. The latter's attenuation of the epiphanic elements here, would suggest that he has a different intention than the other evangelists. Barth claims that "die Jünger seien letztlich doch im Zweifel geblieben, ist schlechterdings undenkbar".⁷⁶⁶ Why this should be absolutely unthinkable is hard to fathom. The passage gives no indication that the disciples could not have persisted in their doubt. Glasson is probably justified in seeing a measure of encouragement in Jesus' commission,⁷⁶⁷ but again, this says nothing about the community as such. In point of fact, the content of the great commission may argue that the doubt in the church persisted. It is certainly singular that Jesus' final commission contains none of the adjurations to heal or exorcise that featured so prominently in the mission discourse. While this may reflect a different conception underlying the new dispensation, it may also reflect the circumstances of a community,

⁷⁶⁴ See the recent exchange of papers in *JSNT*: K. Grayston, "The Translation of Mt 28.17" 21 (1984) 105-9; K.L. McKay, "The Use of *Hoi de* in Matthew 28.17. A Response to K. Grayston" 24 (1985) 71-72; P. W. van der Horst, "Once More: The Translation of οἱ δὲ in Matthew 28.17" 27 (1986) 27-30. The most satisfactory of these is that by van der Horst who concludes that although the οἱ δὲ "can mean (from a strictly grammatical point of view) other persons than the disciples, but, since no other persons are involved here at all, must be part of the disciples" (29 italics his). See, as well, I. P. Ellis, "But Some Doubted", *NTS* 14 (1968) 574-80, 575, and C. H. Giblin, "A Note on Doubt and Reassurance in Mt 28:16-20" *CBQ* 37 (1975) 68-75, 68-72.

⁷⁶⁵ Barth, "Glaube", 285-86. Michel, "The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel: a Contribution to the History of the Easter Message" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 30-41, 33, offers a similar argument.

⁷⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 286.

⁷⁶⁷ Glasson, "Doubt", 73-75.

which could no longer engage in thaumaturgical activity.

Conclusion

The most striking feature of each of above passages therefore, is that they end on an unresolved note. In each case, the community has been confronted with its lack of faith or doubt, and in each case, experiences the reassurance of the Risen Jesus and, and, in two instances, his mandates.⁷⁶⁸ It is possible that this results in renewed faith for the church, but it is never indicated how or whether the community has responded. Given the frequency with which this theme occurs in the first gospel, it would seem more appropriate to view it as a problem which continued to beset the community. Like Paul, it approved the right course, but was unable to perform it. If, as seems likely, the community has lost its ἐξουσία, it remains uncertain whether it might eventually be able to regain the abilities it once had, or whether this possibility is no longer open to them. For the time being, they are immobilized. So while the church is not categorically condemned by Matthew, they are still believers, and are cared for by Jesus. On the other hand, it is reproached for its deficient faith, and in its place, a faith untinged by doubt is advocated for the community.

It is also significant that two of these accounts deal explicitly with the failure of thaumaturgical acts on the part of the community. The reasons for their lack of faith are not specified in the epileptic pericope. Usually, however, little faith signifies an excessive concern for this life and the worries of this life. Hence, it is not impossible that there was an explicit connection between healing and persecution.

The consequences of such a failure within the community would be momentous. Up until this point, the church's ability to heal had been vital to their ministry in a number of respects. Most significantly, it functioned as a source of legitimation. As with the miracles described in the first chapters of Acts, it served as a basis for their christological remarks about the Son of David. It also functioned as

⁷⁶⁸ These mandates could well be the product of Christian prophets. As Boring has shown, 28:18-20 reveals a number of prophetic features, (*Sayings*, 204-6.). If there was a waning of miracles in general, it probably did not include prophecy. Boring argues that the two go together (87-88), but does recognize that in the Didache this no longer applies (88). Matthew's community in this respect would seem to be more akin to the situation of the Didache.

legitimation for their claims to be able to forgive sins. Given the disappearance of their authority, their entire ministry would suddenly be called into question.

The effects of this would be most acute with respect to the crowds. If, as we have argued, much of the ministry to the crowds was predicated on healing, the ministry would suddenly be curtailed. Like the epileptic's father, the crowds would come to the members of the community only to find that they were no longer able to heal. Nor would the crowds have Jesus to turn to. Instead, they would eventually cease to come at all. They would no longer be amazed or astonished at the healings the church performed, because healings were no longer performed. With "signs and wonders" no longer following, they too, would cease to follow. And since the community's claims about Jesus as Son of David, and its claim to forgive sins were predicated on their healing capability, the crowds would certainly cease to pay them as much attention.

The desertion of the crowds would, in turn, be no small shock to Matthew's church. It would, first of all, be a public indication of failure on their part. Concomitant with this, would be their feeling of having been deserted by God, and having failed God, akin perhaps to Israel's experience of the end of prophecy, or for that matter, what Judaism was experiencing in its loss of the temple. While they were able to fault themselves, and attribute it to their doubt and lack of faith, over the course of time, with no assurance that they might regain their lost ἐξουσία, they would need something to take its place. Two features appear to have fulfilled this function. While it is not possible to go into these factors in detail, the first can be identified as Matthew's emphasis on judgement and righteousness.⁷⁶⁹ The second is Matthew's emphasis on understanding.⁷⁷⁰

⁷⁶⁹ For a more detailed discussion of this whole question see Bornkamm, "End-Expectation", *TIM*, 15-38. "Matthew reaches his radical understanding of the law by regarding it in the light of...the universal judgement, which all men, and particularly the disciples have to face. It is into this rigid framework of his understanding of the law that Matthew inserts the specifically Christian motives which distinguish the essence, the faith and life of discipleship, and from this he draws his legitimation and weapon for the controversy of the Church with Israel."

⁷⁷⁰ For further discussion of understanding as it relates to disciples see the sources cited above Note #108.

6. THE VOLTE-FACE OF THE CROWDS

6a 27:62-66

With the demise of the church's therapeutic ministry, Matthew gives some intimations of a defection on the crowds' part. One such indication is at 23:1, where, along with the disciples, the crowds are warned by Jesus about the scribes and Pharisees. It was shown above, that even though this passage may have a manifest teaching component to it, the bitterness and rancour it displays points to an *Auseinandersetzung* between Matthew's community and Pharisaic Judaism. The fact that the crowds need to be warned about the Pharisees suggests that the crowds are once again coming under the sway of these Jewish leaders.⁷⁷¹ That this sway became absolute, is substantiated in part by Matthew's additions of 27:62-66 and 28:11-15 to his passion account.⁷⁷² In the first of these, the high priests and Pharisees ask Pilate to secure the tomb for three days lest the disciples steal Jesus' body, then proclaim his resurrection to the people, so that "the last fraud will be worse than the first".

The inclusion of the Pharisees here is significant for several reasons. The first, is that it is the only time they are mentioned after chapter 23. The second, is that they are paired with the high priests, which is an odd grouping indeed.⁷⁷³ Both these features can probably be explained if the reference to the Pharisees is taken as being transparent. The high priests are the main representatives of Judaism in Jesus' day, and the Pharisees in Matthew's own day.⁷⁷⁴ Matthew's exclusion of them from the passion narrative, indicates that he is not only adhering to his sources, which do not

⁷⁷¹ It also suggests that after the crisis in Matthew's community, some of its members were deserting to the Pharisees. This idea may well underlie 15:12-14, a pericope unique to Matthew (cf. Lk 6:39).

⁷⁷² Both are likely Matthean - Gundry, *Matthew*, 582 ff., 591 ff.; Hill, *Matthew*, 360, suggests these accounts may be based on a "special Jerusalem cycle of tradition".

⁷⁷³ Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 16.

⁷⁷⁴ Martin, *History*, 84; Hummel, *Auseinandersetzung*, 16.

mention the Pharisees either, but that he wishes to associate the Pharisees with the charge that Jesus is a πλάνοος and that his resurrection is likewise a deception.⁷⁷⁵

Especially noteworthy is the fact that the Pharisees attempt to prevent the disciples' message of the resurrection from reaching the people: μήποτε...εἰπωσιν τῷ λαῷ (27:64).⁷⁷⁶ The reason they give is "that the last fraud will be worst than the first". This is a revealing comment, for it suggests that in Matthew's eyes, the church's preaching of the resurrection to the crowds had had a profound effect. It also indicates that the preaching of the church was even more noisome to the Pharisees than the presence of Jesus. This perception fits well with 10:25, and the picture of the church's ministry sketched above.

On the other hand, Matthew's inclusion of both of the above passages is apologetic in nature.⁷⁷⁷ The mere fact that he has chosen to include them suggests that the story of the disciples' theft of Jesus' corpse which had "been spread among the Jews to this day", had been effective. After the dissemination of this story, the church's preaching of the resurrection no longer possessed the credibility it had once had, and now Matthew is forced to explain how this calumny against the church originated. This apologetic strain strongly suggests that the Pharisees had gained in ascendancy over the Jews (including the crowds), and had largely eclipsed Matthew's community. The very term "the Jews" indicates that Matthew and his church have become dissociated from the Jewish people as a whole, even if the apologetic is designed to respond to specific Jewish criticisms.⁷⁷⁸

How the Pharisees were able to woo the crowds away from the influence of Matthew's church cannot be readily determined. It is possible that 27:20 provides a

⁷⁷⁵ That the Pharisees are not mentioned again at 28:11ff. is probably due to the fact that Matthew is concerned with how the false report was originally disseminated. Presumably the Pharisees might have played a later role in the circulation of the story among the Jews up until Matthew's own time.

⁷⁷⁶ Matthew's use of the word λαός here can be taken to refer in large measure to the crowds as 27:24-25 make clear.

⁷⁷⁷ Bultmann, *HST*, 274, 281; Frank J. Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies* (New York: Paulist, 1986) 119. For a more developed narrative about the guard at the tomb, see the Gospel of Peter 8:29-33.

⁷⁷⁸ Pace Davies, *SSM* 286-7, who argues against such a dissociation by trying to interpret "the Jews" in light of Pauline usage.

clue when it relates that the high priests and elders persuaded (ἔπεισαν) the crowds to ask for Barabbas instead of Jesus. Of course, the context is different here, the Pharisees are not mentioned, and it is possible that Matthew's use of the word is simply intended to further inculcate the crowds. Nevertheless, it is not impossible that Matthew's use of ἔπεισαν is also intended to reflect the church's own experience, where the Jewish leaders, in this case the Pharisees, have persuaded the crowds to give up Jesus. Even if this explanation places undue weight on a single word, 27:64 reveals that something of this order took place. The Pharisees were actively engaged in curtailing the church's influence amongst the people, and presumably, persuading them that the disciples were imposters, just as Jesus had been.

Such a line of argumentation would be even more effective, if, as argued above, the community had undergone a crisis of faith, and was no longer able to perform miracles. This, in itself, would furnish sufficient grounds for questioning the church's claims about another greater miracle, namely, Jesus' resurrection.

6b *Matthew 13*

The most decisive indication of a change in the crowds' attitude toward Matthew's community can be seen in chapter 13. As was argued above, the statements made there about the crowds are best taken as applying to the later community. More particularly, they are best taken as Matthew's final pronouncement on the crowds.⁷⁷⁹ The passage which is most revealing in this respect is the interpretation to the parable of the sower. As was shown above, the crowds are implicitly compared with the seed sown on the path. They hear the message of the kingdom, but it does not take root in their hearts, and finally the evil one snatches it away. The message does not take root at all, a factor which indicates that in Matthew's ultimate perspective, the crowds never

⁷⁷⁹ Dupont, "Chapitre", 886-7 cf. 889-93 would like to argue that Matthew is making a moral distinction here, and not explicitly referring to the Jewish crowds. While it cannot be denied that there is a parnetic intention here, Matthew's identification of the crowds and disciples with the two types of hearer is too explicit to be discounted.

were numbered amongst the believers of the community, as compared, say with those who fell away because of persecution⁷⁸⁰ or the cares of the world.

This is rather a startling pronouncement. For one thing, it implies that the church's entire ministry to the crowds had proved to be ineffectual. While the Jerusalem church's ministry to the people in Jerusalem had resulted in thousands of converts before being disrupted by persecution (Ac 8:1), the ministry of Matthew's community appears to Matthew, in retrospect, to have been singularly unproductive. The community's healings and care for the crowds seem to have exerted no lasting effect.

What also emerges from this passage is the absolute character of Matthew's pronouncement about the crowds. The outcome is no longer in doubt - they had been the recipients of the word of the kingdom, and, quite simply, had failed to respond to it. They had had the opportunity, but now, the moment had passed. The very fact that Matthew can indicate that the moment had passed intimates that there is a measure of distance between Matthew's community and the crowds.⁷⁸¹ As with the reference to the Jews at 28:15, the implication is that Matthew and his church are no longer directly involved. They have dissociated themselves from the ministry to the crowds, and are at a sufficient remove to be able to pronounce upon it, as something that is passed.

What this most likely signifies, is that Matthew's community has completed its mission to Israel and has now embarked on a universal mission to all nations.⁷⁸² The judgement at 13:19, therefore, probably reflects part of Matthew's evaluation of the ministry to Israel. While 21:43 is mainly intended as a reproach against the Jewish

⁷⁸⁰ Even though this reference to persecution has been taken over from Mark, it is likely to have had considerable import for Matthew's community.

⁷⁸¹ That this represents old history can be seen from the parable of the tares in the same chapter, where the field is "the world" (13:38) and Matthew's concern is with the separation of good from evil (13:26-30). This theme, in particular, seems to have occupied Matthew latterly, as can also be seen from his additions to the parable of the wicked tenants. After he describes the burning of "their city", an event which is best taken as a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem (Jeremias, *Parables*, 33), he describes the gathering of "both bad and good" for the wedding feast (22:10). They are included because "those invited were not worthy" (22:8). The most natural interpretation is to look upon the bad and good as the gentiles who had responded to the community's message. The fact that some of them were evil appears to have produced controversy in Matthew's community, with Matthew's gospel favouring the final judgement as the best means of separating the good from the evil.

⁷⁸² The Jews would be included in this universalist directive, but no longer have the primacy they had once enjoyed.

leaders, 13:10-23 is Matthew's indictment of the crowds. The substance of this indictment has already been discussed above. The crowds are incapable of perception. Even though they see and hear, they do not see or hear and are devoid of understanding. The similarity of the crowds with their leaders is that both groups are blind. The Pharisees pretend to be able to lead, while the crowds unthinkingly follow them. The result for both is destruction, as 15:14 makes abundantly clear: "They [the Pharisees] are blind guides. And if a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit."

Just as important as the indictment is the situation of this whole complex of events within the plan of God. Matthew 13:10-15 makes it clear that the crowds' obduracy had already been predicted by Jesus and the scriptures as well. Verse 13:12 indicates that Jesus anticipated this situation, while at 13:14ff. it is Jesus himself who invokes Isaiah 6:9ff. to account for the crowds' dullness of heart.

This *Reflexionszitat* has vital significance for Matthew's community, because it helps explain the failure of their mission. The failure, of course, lies in the recalcitrance of the crowds, but the citation is able to situate this recalcitrance within the context of salvation history. Just as Israel had always rejected its prophets, it now rejects its Messiah and his representatives. This situation was already foreseen by Isaiah, and the Messiah himself, in citing the passage, indicates that it will be normative for Matthew's own community. Thus, Matthew's church, in spite of its crisis of faith, has no cause to be alarmed at the failure of their mission. This was something which had long been anticipated, and which received its complete fulfilment in the experience of Matthew's church. The *Reflexionszitat*, like 13:19, constitutes part of Matthew's final judgement on the crowds. They remain obdurate, just as Isaiah predicted they would. In making this pronouncement, Matthew implicitly, if not explicitly, prepares for the universalist mission and explains how the crowds of Israel have relinquished their status as the chosen people of God.⁷⁸³

⁷⁸³ Gnika (*Verstockung*, 97) rightly remarks of some of the elements of 13:10-17 that "Es gehört zu den Eigenheiten des Matthäus, dem Leser seines Evangeliums einen starken Eindruck vom Unglauben des jüdischen Volkes, der seine Ablösung als Eigentumsvolk Gottes rechtfertigt, zu

Yet, even though he is scathing in his comments about the obtuseness of the crowds, his remarks are of a quite different order than his denunciations of the Pharisees in chapter 23. There are several reasons for this. The first is that the Pharisees knowingly set themselves in opposition to the church, and thereby, to God. The attitude of the crowds is less blameworthy, in that they are simply unresponsive. While this, in itself, is culpable, there is still a fleeting hope that Matthew's reproaches might jolt them out of their stupor. While Matthew is not as optimistic as Paul in Romans 11, he probably has not excluded the possibility of the crowds relenting, albeit in accordance with the established plan of God.⁷⁸⁴

The second reason is a consequence of the crowds' one-time involvement with Matthew's community. John Townshend has spoken of a "religious divorce" in connection with John's gospel,⁷⁸⁵ but the analogy is just as appropriate here. The great crowds, which were once adherents of Matthew's community, have now been wooed away by the Pharisees, and will not return. For Matthew's church this has produced no little frustration and anger, not least because it is the Pharisees who have supplanted them. Matthew's anger, therefore, is the product, not only of the crowds' rejection of his church, but his distress at their folly in taking up with the Pharisees, blind guides who are certain to lead them to destruction.

Chapter 13, therefore, does constitute something of a "turning point", though not in the manner envisioned by Kingsbury. Rather, it is primarily concerned with the failure of the post-Easter ministry to the crowds. In 13:10-23, Matthew encapsulates the outcome of the church's ministry, and explains to his community (and to the crowds themselves, if they are disposed to listen) why it is that the crowds failed to heed the message of the church. It constitutes a turning point, because the church turns away from its exclusivist mission to the Jews, and directs its attentions to all nations.

vermitteln."

⁷⁸⁴ For this reason, it is probably best not to regard parabolic speech as a punishment as some authors do (cf. for example, Gnlika, *Verstockung*, 103), but rather, as a mechanism for demonstrating the understanding of the disciples and the obtuseness of the crowds.

⁷⁸⁵ Townshend, "The Gospel of John and the Jews: The Story of a Religious Divorce" in Davies, *Antisemitism*, 72-97.

If 28:18-20 is often described as the key to the entire gospel,⁷⁸⁶ 13:10-23 can be regarded as one vital constituent to this key, since it helps account for the emergence of the mission to all nations.

Its presence at chapter 13 is rather jarring to the historical account which Matthew offers, since his portrayal of the crowds at that point in the narrative hardly warrants the reproaches which are directed at them. On the other hand, it was opportune from the standpoint of his transparent account, since Mark's collection of parables already offered him features that corresponded with his theme, notably the use of parables themselves, and the citation from Isaiah 6:9ff.. Thus it offered him a context in which he could expand on understanding as the sign of the true Christian disciple, and illustrate how and why the crowds lacked it.

Conclusion

In sum, the foregoing discussion suggests that the crowds have forsaken Matthew's community. That Matthew has included apologetic passages such as 27:62-66 and 28:11-14 in his passion account indicates that the Pharisees' dismissal of Jesus' resurrection had begun to affect the populace. Just how successful the Pharisees were can be adjudged from 13:10-23, where Matthew reproaches the crowds for being without perception or understanding. Even though they had heard the message of the kingdom, they had failed to respond and remained obdurate.

There is an obvious apologetic component to all of the above passages. With Matthew 13:10-23 in particular, Matthew makes his intention obvious by situating this transparent passage in a historical framework.⁷⁸⁷ The effect of this superimposition is to show that the crowds have not only been the recipients of Jesus' preaching, but of Matthew's church as well. Both times they fail to respond as they ought to have, and their loss of primacy as the people of God is a fitting response for their recalcitrance.

⁷⁸⁶ See O. Michel, "Conclusion", 35.

⁷⁸⁷ The narrative component of Matthew 13 is more pronounced than in any of the other discourses.

The salvation-historical theme is closely related to the apologetic one. In failing to respond to the preaching of the community, the crowds align themselves with Israel as a whole, which has always rejected those sent to her. In the same way, the community by virtue of its failed ministry to the crowds, aligns itself with the experience of Jesus and those messengers of God who preceded him. Their failure also brings one phase of salvation history to a close. The crowds unrelenting obduracy marks the end of the exclusivist ministry to Israel, and prepares for the universalist ministry to all nations which Jesus will inaugurate at the end of the gospel.

7. CONCLUSION

The foregoing discussion of the post-Easter ministry of Matthew's church to the Jewish crowds emerged with the following results. After Jesus' death, Matthew's church continues to adhere to Jesus' mission directives as outlined in chapter 10. Their mission is explicitly modelled on that of Jesus, and, like him, they go out to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, which includes the crowds in its purview. Like Jesus, the church also proclaims the advent of the kingdom of heaven (10:7) and, more particularly, performs healings and exorcisms. On the basis of their therapeutic ἐξουσία they also offer forgiveness for sins. The crowds are astonished by such activity, just as they were by Jesus' obvious authority to heal, teach and cast out demons, and they react with the same sort of enthusiasm. They attach themselves to Matthew's community in considerable numbers, and, largely because of the healing miracles performed by the church, give heed to the church's claims about Jesus as the Son of David. Even when the Pharisees directly intervene, the crowds still appear more inclined to pay attention to the church, since it has the authority to back up its words.

This situation appears to have provoked reprisals by the Jewish leaders. Either because they feared the church's influence, or because they thought that church members were practitioners of magic, they persecuted Matthew's community. It is

whether it did or not, it is evident that Matthew's community suddenly found itself in a position where, because of its little faith, it no longer had the ἐξουσία to heal or perform miracles. As it was this very activity that had attracted the crowds in the first place and sanctioned the church's authority, the crowds began to desert in large numbers. Their desertion was aided by the Pharisees, who cast doubt on the church's claims about the resurrection of Jesus.

Matthew's church, does not appear to have recovered from its problem of little faith. Its authority to forgive becomes something practised within the confines of the community, and no longer outside of it. Its sources of authority also begin to shift from its thaumaturgical activity to its interpretation of the law and of the prophets. Matthew's church not only advocates "a better righteousness" in its fulfilment of the law, but a messianic interpretation of the law and the prophets which sees in Jesus' life the fulfilment of scripture. This would be apparent to anyone with understanding, but the crowds are now unreceptive to the word of the kingdom, and totally devoid of understanding. They remain under the sway of the Pharisees, and act as though their one-time involvement with Matthew's community had never taken place. Their obdurate attitude is ultimately interpreted by Matthew and his church as a fulfilment of prophecy, and signals the end of the exclusivist mission to Israel, in favour of a mission to all nations.

If this reconstruction - one that is admittedly sketchy and speculative - does reflect part of the history of Matthew's community, why has he bothered to include it in his gospel? The first reason is probably *heilsgeschichtlich*. Matthew, in aligning the ministry of the disciples almost completely with that of Jesus, shows that his church is part of the continuum which extends back to Jesus, John the Baptist and all the prophets and messengers of God. As with all true messengers of God, their message has largely been rejected, and they have suffered persecution from their own people because of their proclamation. The crowds' obduracy also forms part of this salvation-historical continuum. Just as Israel had always rejected those sent to help her, including Jesus, now, in the person of the crowds they have also failed to acknowledge

the most recent of these messengers, namely, Matthew's church. Like Israel before them, they are once again bringing to fulfilment αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν.

A related reason for Matthew's portrayal is apologetic. Matthew's account of the community's initial ministry to the crowds indicates the extent to which his church had cared for them. It had healed them, cast out their demons, fed them and preached to them. In return, the crowds had rejected the church as soon as its therapeutic authority had begun to wane. From that point onward, the crowds had proved themselves insensible to the word of the community. They had heard the church's preaching but failed to hear it, or understand it. Matthew makes it clear, therefore, that the culpability resides with the crowds. The church had done all it could possibly do, and been rejected. It is no surprise that its exclusivist mission ceased in favour of one aimed at all nations.

Finally, one might conclude that there is a christological component to Matthew's account. While Jesus does not appear in the church's ministry to the crowds, its entire ministry is consciously modelled on his. The very fact that it is so difficult to dissociate the church's ministry from that of Jesus himself indicates how tightly the two are interwoven. This results from their awareness that he is with them (28:20), and that the outworking of their ministry is simply a continuation of his. This is made especially clear in the great commission, where it is Jesus who brings their old ministry to a close and embarks them on a new one.

Part IV

CONCLUSION

What, in conclusion, can be said about the crowds in Matthew's gospel? At the historical level, they are characterized by Matthew as a coherent group, distinct from the Jewish leaders on the one hand, and from the disciples on the other. They are Jews, who are sympathetic but not committed to Jesus. While they are astonished by Jesus' words and deeds, this represents no more than a preliminary response to him. Their following of Jesus does not reflect commitment on their part, but rather, a desire for healing. Although they come close to an awareness of who Jesus is in their use of the title Son of David, their designation of Jesus as a prophet indicates the ultimate inadequacy of their understanding. This lack of understanding culminates in their involvement in Christ's passion, and their acceptance, with the Jewish leaders, of the responsibility for Jesus' death.

The transparent account of the crowds follows much the same pattern. Once again, the crowds are a Jewish group distinct from the church or the Pharisees. Initially, the crowds are responsive to the thaumaturgical ministry of Matthew's church, as well its proclamation of Jesus. Once the church loses its ability to heal, the crowds cease being receptive. Even though they have heard the message of the kingdom, they ultimately fail to respond and end up obdurate like their leaders, the Pharisees.

Given this appraisal of the role of the crowds in the gospel, why is it that they come across in an ambivalent light? One reason is that the crowds in the first gospel

are made to perform various functions, some of which are contradictory. At the historical level, this contradiction is most apparent in the way Matthew uses the crowds both christologically and apologetically. In the first instance, the crowds function as a foil to emphasize the majesty and humility of Christ. They represent a needy Israel welcoming and receiving the ministrations of its Lord. On the other hand, the apologetic component shows that the crowds are no different from their forbears, and that they are just as willing to implicate themselves in Jesus' death, as their fathers were in the deaths of the prophets. In both instances the crowds function almost as ciphers for Israel, with the context determining the type of the picture of Israel to be presented.

The second reason for this ambivalence is that Matthew has occasionally juxtaposed the portrayal of the crowds at the historical level of his gospel with that of the crowds from the post-Easter situation. The most significant example of this, is his emphasis of the crowds' obduracy in chapter 13. Their deficiency of understanding receives such emphasis that it jars with the portrayal of the crowds at the historical level which is developed between 4:25 and 23:1. Matthew is prepared to put up with this inconsistency because the parable framework which he has derived from Mark lends itself so admirably to the situation of the post-Easter crowds. Once again, therefore, it is the dual function the crowds are made to play which produces the ambivalent and refracted picture of the crowds which is so characteristic of the gospel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference Works

- Aland, K. et al. (ed.). *The Greek New Testament*. 3 Ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- Aland, Kurt (ed.). *Vollständige Konkordanz zum Griechischen Neuen Testament*. Band II, Spezialübersichten. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1978.
- Bachmann, H. and W.A. Slaby. *Computer-Konkordanz zum Novum Testamentum Graece von Nestle-Aland 26 Auflage, und zum Greek New Testament, 3rd ed.* Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung und vom Rechenzentrum der Universität Münster. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Balz, Horst and Gerhard Schneider (eds.). *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. 3 Bde. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1981-83.
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, tr. R.W. Funk. Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1968.
- Brown, Colin et al., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 3 Vols. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1975-8.
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.). *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 Vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.
- Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément*. Paris: Libraire Letouzey et Ané, 1960.
- Hammond, N.G.L., and Scullard, H.H. (eds.). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.
- Kittel, G. and Friedrich G. (eds.). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 Vols. Tr. G.W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1964-76.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. New Edition, revised by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Morgenthaler, Robert. *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* 3 Auflage. Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, (1958) 1982.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906-1976.
- Nestle E. and Aland K. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 26 Auflage. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.
- Reicke, Bo, and Leonhard Rost (eds.). *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch*. 3 Bde. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 3rd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919.
- Wissawa G.(ed.) *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1958.

Commentaries

- Albright, W.F. and Mann, C.S. *Matthew*, AB 26. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- Allen, Willoughby, C. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, ICC, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907.
- Beare, Frank W. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981.
- Bonnard, Pierre. *L'Évangile selon Saint Matthieu* CNT I. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963.
- Davies, W.D. and Allison, Dale C., Jr. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, I. ICC Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1988.
- Fenton, J.C. *The Gospel of Saint Matthew*, PGC Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963.
- Filson, Floyd. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. BNTC London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Gaechter, Paul. *Das Matthäus Evangelium*. Innsbruck: Tyrolia-Verlag, 1963.
- Gnilka, Joachim. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. 2 Bde. Freiburg: Herder, 1986 (I. Teil), 1988 (II. Teil).
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament I. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt Berlin, (1968) 1981.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on his Literary and Theological Art..* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1982.
- Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Johnson, Sherman, F. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. IB VII. New York: Abingdon & Cokesbury Press, 1951.
- Klostermann. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 4. 4. Auf. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (1927) 1971.
- Lagrange, M.J. *Évangile selon Saint Matthieu*. Paris: Libraire Victor Lecoffre, 1923.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst, and Schmauch, Werner (ed.). *Das Evangelium des Matthäus*. 4. Auf. Meyer Kommentar. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, (1956) 1967.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7. A Commentary*. Tr. W. C. Linss. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- McNeile, Alan Hugh. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Macmillan, 1915.
- Patte, Daniel. *The Gospel According to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Plummer, Alfred. *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. London: Elliot Stock, 1909.

- Radermakers, Jean. *Au fil de l'évangile selon saint Matthieu..* 2 Tomes. Louvain: Institut d'Études Theologiques, 1972.
- Sand, Alexander. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* Regensberger Neues Testament I. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1986.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthäus: seine Sprache, sein Ziel seine Selbstständigkeit.* Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1957.
- Schmid, Josef. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* Regensberger Neues Testament I. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1965.
- Schnackenburg, R. *Matthäusevangelium 1:1-16:20.* Die Neue Echter Bibel I. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985.
- Schniewind, J. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* Das Neue Testament Deutsch I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News According to Matthew.* tr. David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975.
- Staab, K. *Das Evangelium Nach Matthäus.* Würzburg: Echter, 1951.
- Stendahl, Krister. "Matthew", M. Black (ed.) *Peake's Commentary on the Bible.* Walton-on-Thames: Nelson, 1962, 769-798.
- Trilling, W. *The Gospel According to St. Matthew.* 2 vols. tr. K. Smyth. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- Weiss, Bernhard. *Das Matthäus-Evangelium.* 9 Auflage, MK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1898.
- Wellhausen, J. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus.* Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Matthäus.* 4 Auf. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1984.

Monographs and Essays

- Abel, Ernst L. "Who Wrote Matthew", *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 138-52.
- Achilles, E. "Evil, Bad, Wickedness", *NIDNTT* I, 561-67.
- Achtemeier, Paul J. "An Apocalyptic Shift in Early Christian Tradition: Reflections on Some Canonical Evidence", *CBQ* 45 (1983) 231-48.
- . "The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch", Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1978.
- Aerts, T.L. "Suivre Jésus: Évolution d'un Thème Biblique dans les Évangiles Synoptiques", *ETL* 42 (1966) 476-512.
- Aichinger, Hermann. "Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Epileptiker - Perikope Mk 9,14 - 29 par Mt 17,14 - 21 par Lk 9,37 - 43a" in A. Fuchs (hrsg.), *Probleme der Forschung* SNTU A 3. München: Herold Wien, 1978.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. "Matt. 23:39 - Luke 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy" *JSNT* 18 (1983) 75-84.
- Alon, Gedaliah. *The Jews in their Land in the Talmudic Age (70-640 C.E.)*. 2 vols. Tr./ed./ Gershon Levi. Jerusalem: Magnus Press, 1980, 1984.
- Anderson, Janice Capel. "Double and Triple Stories, the Implied Reader and Redundancy in Matthew", *Semeia* 31 (1985) 71-89.
- . "Matthew: Sermon and Story" *SBL 1988 Seminar Papers* Atlanta: Scholars Press 1988, 496 - 507.
- Angel, G.T.D. "Leaven", *NIDNTT* vol. II, 461-63.
- Annen, F. 'θαυμάζω' *EWNT* II, s.v. cols. 332-4.
- Arens, Eduardo. *The HΛΘON - Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-Critical Investigation*. OBO 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976.
- Ashton, John. "The Identity and Function of the 'IOYΔAIOI in the Fourth Gospel", *NovT* 27 (1985) 40-75.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Baarlink, Heinrich. *Die Eschatologie der synoptischen Evangelien*, *BWANT* 20 Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1986.
- Bacon, Benjamin W. "The Matthean Discourse in Parables Mt. 13:1-52", *JBL* 46 (1927) 237-65.
- . *Studies in Matthew*. London: Constable and Co., 1930.
- Baird, J. Arthur. *Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Baltensweiler, Heinrich, and Bo Reicke (eds.). *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament*. Zürich:

Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Balz, Horst. 'ἐκπλήσσομαι', *EWNT* I, col. 1023.

_____. 'μήτι', *EWNT* II, col. 1049.

_____. 'ὄχλος' *EWNT* II, col. 1354-55.

_____. 'Συρία', *EWNT* III, col. 746-7.

_____. 'φοβέομαι' *EWNT* III, col. 1026-1033.

_____. 'φοβέω, φοβέομαι, κτλ' *TDNT* IX 189-219.

Bammel, E., "Erwägungen zur Eschatologie Jesu", *SE* III, *TU* 88 (1964) 3-32.

_____. (ed.). "The Trial of Jesus", *Studies in Biblical Theology*, 2nd series. London: SCM 1970.

Bammel, E. and Moule, C.F.D. (eds.) *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*. Cambridge: University Press, 1984.

Banks, Robert. *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*, SNTSMS 28 Cambridge: University Press 1975.

_____. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law: Authenticity and Interpretation in Matthew 5:17-20", *JBL* 93 (1974) 226-42.

Barr, David L. "The Drama of Matthew's Gospel", *Theology Digest* 24 (1976) 349-59.

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, 2nd ed. London: S.P.C.K., 1978.

_____. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. London: SPCK, 1947.

Barta, Karen A., "Mission in Matthew: The Second Discourse as Narrative" *SBL 1988 Seminar Papers* Atlanta: Scholars Press 1988, 527-35.

Barth, Gerhard. "Auseinandersetzung um die Kirchenzucht im Umkreis des Matthäusevangeliums", *ZNW* 69 (1978-79), 158-77.

_____. "Glaube und Zweifel in den synoptischen Evangelien", *ZTK* 72 (1975) 269-92.

_____. "Matthew's Understanding of the Law", *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, G. Bornkamm, G. Barth and H.J. Held. Tr. Percy Scott. London: SCM, 1982 (2nd ed.).

_____. 'ὀλιγοπιστία κτλ', *EWNT* II, cols. 1237-8.

Bartnicki, Roman. "Il Carattere Messianico Delle Pericopi di Marco e Matteo sull'Ingresso di Gesù in Gerusalemme (Mc 11.1-10; Mt. 21.1-9)", *Rivista Biblica* 25 (1977) 5-27.

Baumbach, Günther. "Die Mission im Matthäus-Evangelium", *TLZ* 92 (1967) col. 889-893.

_____. *Das Verständnis des Bösen in den synoptischen Evangelien*. Berlin:

Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.

Baumgarten, A. I. "The Pharisaic *Paradosis*", *HTR* 80 (1987) 63-77.

Beare, Frank W. "Jesus as Teacher and Thaumaturge: the Matthean Portrait", *SE VII, TU* 126 (1982) 31-39.

———. "The Sayings of Jesus in the Gospel According to St. Matthew", *SE IV, TU* 102 (1968) 146-57.

———. "The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge. Matthew 10 and Parallels", *JBL* 89 (1970) 1-13.

Beilner, Wolfgang. *Christus und die Pharisäer: Exegetische Untersuchung über Grund und Verlauf der Auseinandersetzungen*. Wien: Verlag Herder, 1959.

Benoit, Pierre. *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, tr. Benet Weatherhead. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1969.

Berger, Klaus. *Die Amen-Worte Jesu. Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Legitimation in apokalyptischer Rede*. BZNW 39. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.

———. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesus: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament Teil I: Markus und Parallelen*. WMANT 40 Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972.

———. "Die Königlichen Messiastraditionen des Neuen Testaments", *NTS* 20 (1974) 1-44.

Bertram, Georg. "θαῦμα κατλ", *TDNT* III: 27-42.

———. "καλός", *TDNT* III: 550-56.

Best, Ernest. *Mark: The Gospel as Story*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983.

———. "The Revelation to Evangelize the Gentiles", *JTS* 35, Pt.I (1984) 1-30.

———. "The Role of the Disciples in Mark", *NTS* 23 (1976-77) 377-401.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Cosmogony and Ethics in the Sermon on the Mount" in *idem, Essays*, 89-123.

———. "An Episode in the Last Judgement (Matt. 7:21-23)" in *idem, Essays*, 125-57.

———. *Essays on the Sermon on the Mount*, tr. L. L. Wellborn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

———. *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament*, BHT 37. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1967.

———. "The Sermon on the Mount: Its Literary Genre and Function (Matt. 5:3 – 7:27)" in *Essays* 1-16.

Betz, Otto. "Jesu Evangelium vom Gottesreich" in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.), *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*. WUNT 28 J. C. B. Mohr: Tübingen 1983. 55-77.

———. "Neues und Altes in Geschichtshandeln Gottes. Bemerkungen zu Matthäus 13:51f.", Helmut Feld and Josef Nolte (eds.) *Wort Gottes in der Zeit*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag. 1973. 69-84.

Betz, Otto, et al. (eds.). *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel*. AGSU V. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

———. *Offenbarung und Schrifterforschung in der Qumransekte*. WUNT 6. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960.

Beyer. "θεραπεύω" *EWNT* II.

Bietenhard, Hans. "Enemy etc.", *NIDNTT* I 553-55.

———. "People", *NIDNTT* II 800-801.

Black, II, C. Clifton, "Depth of Characterization and Degrees of Faith in Matthew" *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989. 604-23.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

———. "The Parables as Allegory", *BJRL* 42 (1960) pp. 273-87.

Blair, Edward P. *Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1960.

Blendinger, L. "ἀκολουθέω s.v. Disciple" *NIDNTT* I. 480-83.

Blenkinsopp, J. "The Hidden Messiah and His Entry into Jerusalem", *Scripture* 13 (1961) 51-56, 81-88.

———. "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry", *JBL* 80 (1961) pp. 55-64.

Blinzler, Josef. *Der Prozess Jesu*, 4. Auf. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1969.

Blinzler, J., et al. (eds.). *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963.

Bloch, Renée. "Quelques Aspects de la Figure de Moïse dans la Tradition Rabbinique", in H. Cazelles et al. (eds.), *Moïse, L'Homme de l'Alliance*. Tournai: Desclée & Co., 1955, 93-167.

Böcher, Otto. "Matthäus und die Magie" in Schenke, *Studien*, 11-24.

Bonnard, Pierre. "Matthieu, Éducateur du Peuple Chrétien", in A. Descamps and R. P. André de Halleux (eds.), *Mélanges Bibliques*. Duculot: Gembloux, 1970.

Borg, Marcus J. *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus*, SBEC 5. New York: Edwin Mellen, 1984.

Boring, M. Eugene. *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in The Synoptic Tradition*, SNTSMS 46. Cambridge: University Press, 1982.

Bornkamm, G. "μυστήριον κτλ" *TDNT* 4, 802-28.

- _____. "Der Aufbau der Bergpredigt", *NTS* 24 (1977-78) pp. 419-32.
- _____. "The Authority to 'bind' and 'loose' in the Church in Matthew's Gospel. The Problem of Sources in Matthew's Gospel", in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 85-97.
- _____. "Matthäus als Interpret der Herrenworte", *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 79 (1954) col. 341-46.
- _____. "The Risen Lord and the Earthly Jesus", *idem*, *TIM*, 301-27.
- Bornkamm, G., Barth, G., and Held, H.J. *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*. NTL tr. Percy Scott. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Borsch, F. H. "Who has ears", *Anglican Theological Review* 52 (1970) 131-41.
- Bosch, David. *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftschau Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zur Eschatologie der synoptischen Evangelien*, ATANT 36 Zürich: Zwingli Verlag (1959).
- Boucher, Madeline. *The Mysterious Parable, A Literary Study*. CBQMS 6 Washington: The C.B.A.A., 1977.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos*. Tr. John E. Steeley. Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1970 (Göttingen: 1913).
- Brandenburger, Egon. *Das Recht des Weltenrichters: Untersuchung zu Matthäus 25, 31-46*. SBS 99. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980.
- Brandon, S.G.F. *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth*. London: Batsford, 1968.
- Braumann, G. "Die Zweizahl und Verdoppelungen im Matthäus Evangelium", *TZ* 24 (1968) 255-66.
- _____. "Jesu Erbarmen nach Matthäus", *TZ* 19 (1963), 305-17.
- _____. "Der sinkende Petrus: Matth.14,28-31", *TZ* (1966) 403-14.
- Braun, Herbert. *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte*. 2 Band, 1-Das Spätjudentum; 2-Die Synoptiker. BHT 24. J.C.B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1969.
- Broer, I. *Freiheit vom Gesetz und Radikalisierung des Gesetzes: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Evangelium Matthäus*, SBS 98. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1980.
- _____. "Das Gericht des Menschensohnes über die Völker", *Bibel und Leben* 11 (1970) 273-95.
- Brown, John Pairman. "The Form of 'Q' Known to Matthew", *NTS* 8 (1961/2) 27-42.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977.
- _____. *The Churches the Apostles Left Behind*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984.

- _____. "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *MYSTERION*" *Bib* 39 (1958) 426-481.
- Brown, Raymond E. and Meier, John P. *Antioch and Rome. New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
- Brown, R.E., Donfried, K. P. and Reumann, John. *Peter in the New Testament*. London: Geoffrey Chapman (1973) 1974.
- Brown, Schuyler. "The Matthean Apocalypse", *JSNT* 4 (1979) 2-27.
- _____. "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission", *NovT* 22 (1980) 193-221.
- _____. "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section (Mt 9:35-11:1)", *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73-90.
- _____. "The Secret of the Kingdom of God", *JBL* 92 (1973) 60-74.
- _____. "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel", *ST* 31 (1977) 21-32.
- _____. "Universalism and Particularism in Matthew's Gospel: A Jungian Approach" *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers* Atlanta: Scholars Press 1989 388 - 99.
- Bruce, F.F. *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. London: Tyndale Press, 1960.
- Bultmann, R. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, tr. G.R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- _____. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. tr. John Marsh, 2nd German ed. with 1963 suppl. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Burger, Christoph. *Jesus als Davidssohn: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970.
- _____. "Jesus Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9", *ZTK* 70 (1973) 272-87.
- Burnett, Fred W. "Characterization and Christology in Matthew: Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew" *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989, 588 - 603.
- _____. *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in Matthew*. Washington: University Press of America, 1981.
- Carlisle, C. R. "Jesus' Walking on the Water: A Note on Matthew 14.22-23", *NTS* 31 (1985) 151-55.
- Carlston, Charles E. "Interpreting the Gospel of Matthew", *Int* 29 (1975) 3-12.
- _____. "Parable and Allegory Revisted: An Interpretative Review", *CBQ* 43 (1981) 228-42.
- _____. *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- _____. "The Things That Defile (Mark VII.14) and the Law in Matthew and Mark" *NTS* 15 (1968) 75-96.

- Carroll, Robert P. *When Prophecy Failed: Reactions and Responses to Failure in the Old Testament Prophetic Traditions*. London: SCM, 1979.
- Catchpole, David R. "John the Baptist, Jesus and the Parable of the Tares", *SJT* 31 (1978) 557-70.
- Cazelles, H. et al. (eds.). *Moïse: L'Homme de L'Alliance*. Tournai: Descleé & Co., 1955.
- Cerfaux, L. et al. (ed.). *L'attente du Messie*. Bruges: Descleé de Brouwer, 1958.
- Charette, Blaine. "A Harvest for the People? An Interpretation of Matthew 9.37f." *JSNT* 38 (1990), 29-35.
- Charlesworth, James A. Review of Joachim Schüpphaus *Die Psalmen Salomos: Eine Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts* ALGHJ 7. Leiden: Brill, 1977 in *JAAR* 50 (1982), 292-293.
- Charpentier, Étienne. "Le Chapitre des Parables chez Matthieu, *Foi et Vie* 78 (1979) 101-106.
- Charue, André. *L'Incrédulité des Juifs dans le Nouveau Testament. Étude historique, exégétique et théologique*. Gembloux, J. Duculot, 1929. Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Series II, 21.
- Chilton, Bruce D. *The Glory of Israel: The Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum*. JSOTSS, 23. Sheffield: JSOT, 1983.
- . *The Isaiah Targum*, ed. and tr. The Aramaic Bible, Vol. 11. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.
- . "Jesus ben David; Reflections on the *Davidssonfrage*", *JSNT* 14 (1982) 88-112.
- . ed. *The Kingdom of God*. Issues in Religion and Theology 5. London: SPCK 1984.
- Christ, Felix. *Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1970.
- Citron, Bernhard. "The Multitude in the Synoptic Gospels", *SJT* 7 (1954) 408-18.
- Clark, David J. and Waard, J. De. "Discourse Structure in Matthew's Gospel", *Scriptura* (1982) Special issue, Part I, 1-97.
- Clark, Kenneth Willis. "Galilee", *IDB* II, 344-47.
- . "The Gentile Bias in Matthew", in J. C. Sharpe III (ed.) *The Gentile Bias and Other Essays*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.
- Cohn, Haim. *The Trial and Death of Jesus*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1972.
- Comber, Joseph A. "The verb *Therapeuō* in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 97 (1978) 431-34.
- Combrink, H. J. B. "The Macrostructure of the Gospel of Matthew", *Neotestamentica*

16 (1982) 1-20.

———. "The Structure of the Gospel of Matthew as Narrative", *Tyndale Bulletin* 34 (1983), 61-90.

Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles: Hermeneia*. tr. J. Limburg, et al. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

———. *Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie der Lukas*. 5 Auflage. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 17. Tübingen: J.C. B. Mohr, 1964.

———. "Present and Future in the Synoptic Tradition", Tr. Jack Wilson. *JTC* 5 (1968), 26-44.

Cook, Michael S. "Interpreting 'Pro-Jewish' Passages in Matthew", *HUCA* 54 (1983) 135-46.

Cope, Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. CBQMS 5. Washington: C.B.A.A., 1976.

Cothenet, E. "Les prophètes chrétiens dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu" Didier (ed.) *L'Évangile*, 281-308.

Cullman, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*, tr. S. C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall, 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1963.

———. *Petrus. Jünger-Apostel-Märtyrer. Das historische und das theologische Petrusproblem*. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1952.

Dabek, P. "Siehe, er erschienen Moses und Elias", *Biblica* 23 (1942), 175-89.

Dahl, Nils, A. "The Passion Narrative in Matthew" in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 42-55.

Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus*. Tr. D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.

Danker, Frederick W. "Fresh Perspectives on Matthean Theology. A Review Article", *Concordia Theological Monthly* 41 (1970), 478-90.

Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: The Athlone Press, 1956.

Davies, Alan T. (ed.). *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York: Paulist, 1979.

Davies, Paul E. "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet", *JBL* 44 (1945) 241-54.

Davies, W. D. *The Gospel and the Land*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1974.

———. *Introduction to Pharisaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

———. "The Jewish Background of the Teaching of Jesus: Apocalyptic and Pharisaism", *ET* 59 (1947-48) 233-37.

———. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: University Press, 1964.

- Davies, W.D. and Daube, D. (eds.). *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Cambridge: University Press (1954) 1964.
- Delling, Gerhard. "πλήθος, πληθύνω". *TDNT* VI, 274-83.
- Denis, A. M. "Les Parables du royaume: révélation de mystère (Matt. 13)", *Communio*, 1 (1968) 327-46.
- Descamps, Albert. "Le Messianisme Royal dans le Nouveau Testament", in ed. L. Cerfaux et al. *L'Attente du Messie*, Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1958, 57-84.
- . "Moïse dans les Évangiles et dans la Tradition Apostolique", in H. Cazelles et al. *Moïse, l'homme de l'Alliance*, Tournai: Desclée & Co. 1955, 171-87.
- . "Rédaction et Christologie dans la Récit matthéen de la Passion" in Didier, *L'Évangile* 359-415.
- Descamps, A. et al. (eds.). *Mélanges Bibliques*. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.
- Deutsch, Celia. *Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25-30*. *JSNTMS* 18. Sheffield: JSOT 1987.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*, tr. Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934.
- Didier, M. (ed.) *L'Évangile selon Matthieu. Rédaction et Théologie*, BETL 29. Gembloux: Éditions J. Duculot, 1972.
- Dillon, Richard S. "Towards a Tradition—History of the Parables of the True Israel (Matthew 21,33 – 23,14)", *Biblica* 47 (1966) 1-42.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. "Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist" in Stanton, *Interpretation* 19-29.
- Dodd, Charles Harold. *History and the Gospel*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938, rev. 1964.
- . "Jesus as Teacher and Prophet", G.K.D. Bell and A. Deissman (eds.) *Mysterium Christi* 1931, 67-86.
- . "Matthew and Paul", in *idem*, *New Testament Studies*. Manchester: University Press, 1953, 53-66.
- Doeve, Jan Willem. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Te Assen Bij: Van Gorcum and Co., 1953.
- Donahue, John R., *The Gospel in Parable*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.
- Donaldson, Terence L. *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology*, *JSNTSS* 8. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Doty, William G. "An Interpretation: Parable of the Weeds and Wheat", *Interpretation* 25 (1971) 185-93.

- Doyle, B. Rod. "Matthew's Intention as Discerned by his Structure", *RB* 95 (1988) 34-54.
- Drury, John. *The Parable in the Gospels*. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- Duling, Dennis C. "The Promises to David and Their Entrance into Christianity - Nailing Down a Likely Hypothesis", *NTS* 20 (1973).
- _____. "Solomon, Exorcism and Son of David", *HTR* 68 (1975) 235-52.
- _____. "The Therapeutic Son of David: An Element in Matthew's Christological Apologetic", *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 392-410.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *Christology in the Making*. London: SCM, 1980.
- _____. "Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus" in Neusner et al., *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism* Philadelphia: Fortress 1988 264 - 89
- Dupont, Jacques. "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Mt 11, 2-6; Luc 7, 18-23)", *NRT* 83 (1961) 805-821, 943-59.
- _____. *Les Béatitudes*, Tome II, *La Bonne Nouvelle*. Paris: Gabalda, 1969.
- _____. "Le Chapitre des Paraboles", *NRT* 89 (1967) 800-820.
- _____. "Le Couple Parabolique du Sénevé du Levain" in G. Strecker (ed.), *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie*, F.S. für H. Conzelmann. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1975, 331-45.
- _____. "L'évangile de saint Matthieu: quelques clés de lecture", *Communautés et Liturgies* 1 (1975) 3-40.
- _____. *Mariage et Divorce dans l'évangile*. Bruges: Abbaye de Saint André, 1959.
- _____. "La Parole du Semeur", *Foie et Vie* 66 (1967) 3-25.
- _____. "Les Paraboles du Sénevé et du Levain", *NRT* 89 (1967) 897-913.
- _____. "Les Paraboles du Trésor et de la Perle", *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 408-18.
- _____. "Le Point de Vue de Matthieu dans le chapitre des paraboles" in Didier, *L'Évangile* 221-59.
- _____. *Pourquoi des Paraboles? La méthode parabolique de Jésus. Lire la Bible* 46. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1977.
- _____. *Les Tentations de Jésus au Désert*. Studia Neotestamentica: Studia 4. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968.
- Eckert, W., et al. (eds.) *Antijudaismus im Neuen Testament? Exegetische und systematische Beiträge*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1967.
- Edwards, James R. "The Use of ΗΠΟΣΕΠΧΕΣΘΑΙ in the Gospel of Matthew", *JBL* 106/1 (1987) 65-74.
- Edwards, Richard A. *Matthew's Story of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.

- _____. *The Sign of Jonah: The Theology of the Evangelists and Q*. SBT: second series 18. London: SCM, 1971.
- _____. "Uncertain Faith: Matthew's Portrait of the Disciples" in Fernando Segovia (ed.), *Discipleship in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Eichholz, Georg. *Auslegung der Bergpredigt*. 3 Auf. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1975.
- _____. *Gleichnisse der Evangelien: Form Überlieferung Auslegung*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag. 1971.
- Elderen, Bastiaan van, "The Purpose of Parables According to Matthew 13:10-17", R. N. Longenecker and M.C. Tenney (eds.). *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, 180-90.
- Ellis, E. Earle. "Prophecy in the New Testament Church and Today", in J. Panagopoulos (ed.) *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*, *NovTSup* 45. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Ellis, I. P. "But Some Doubted", *NTS* 14 (1967-8) 574-80.
- Ellis, P. F. *Matthew: his Mind and his Message*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1974.
- Ernst, Josef. *Anfänge der Christologie*. SBS 57. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1972.
- _____. *Johannes der Täufer: Interpretation - Geschichte - Wirkungsgeschichte* Berlin: de Gruyter 1989
- Farmer, W. "The Post-Sectarian Character of Matthew and its Post-War Setting in Antioch of Syria", *PRS* 3 (1976) 235-47.
- Fascher, Erich. *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Giessen: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1927.
- Fenton, John C. "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew", *SE I, TU* 73 (1959) 174-79.
- Feuillet, A. "Le Caractère Universel du Jugement et la Charité sans Frontières", *NRT* 112 (1980) 179-96.
- _____. "Les Perspectives propres à chaque évangéliste dans le récit de la Transfiguration", *Bib* 39 (1958) 281-330.
- _____. "La Synthèse Eschatologique de Saint Matthieu (xxiv-xxv)" *RB* 56 (1949) 340-64.
- Fiedler, Peter and Zeller, Dieter (eds.). *Gegenwart und kommendes Reich*. SBB. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk Verlag, 1975.
- Fiedler, Peter. "Gegenwart und Zukunft der βασιλεία im Matthäusevangelium" in Peter Fiedler and Dieter Zeller (eds.) *Gegenwart und kommendes Reich*. SBB. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975.
- Field, D. H. "ἐκπλήσσω s.v. Ecstasy, Astonishment, Distraction, Honor, Madness". *NIDNTT* I, 529-30.

- Filson, Floyd V. "Broken Patterns in the Gospel of Matthew", *JBL* 75 (1956) 227-31.
- Fischel, H. A. "Martyr and Prophet" *JQR* 37 (1946-47) 265-280, 363-86.
- Fischer, Karl Martin. "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zur Passionsgeschichte des Matthäus", in J. Rogge and G. Schille (eds.) *Theologische Versuche* II, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1970.
- Fisher, Loren R. "Can this be the Son of David", in F. Thomas Trotter (ed.) *Jesus and the Historian* Philadelphia: Westminster Press (1968) 82-97.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Anti-Semitism and the Cry of 'All the People' (Mt 27:25)", *TS* 26 (1965) 667-71.
- _____. "Aramaic Evidence Affecting the Interpretation of *Hosanna* in the New Testament" in G. F. Hawthorne and O. Betz (eds.) *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1987. 110-18.
- _____. "κύριος", *EWNT* II, col. 811-20.
- _____. "The Son of David Tradition and Matt. 22:41-46 and Parallels", *Concilium* 10 (1966) 40-46.
- Flender, Helmut. "Lehren und Verkündigung in den synoptischen Evangelien", *EvT* 25 (1965) 701-14.
- Flowers, H. J. "Matthew xxiii:15" *ET* LXXIII (1961-2) 67-9.
- Flusser, David. "Two Anti-Jewish Montages in Matthew", *Immanuel* 5 (1975) 37-45.
- Foerster, Werner. "ἔχθρα, ἐχθρός", *TDNT* II, 811-15.
- _____. "ὄρος", *TDNT* V, 475-87.
- Foerster, W. et al. "σώζω κτλ" *TDNT* VII, 965-1024.
- Foerster, Werner and Quell, G. "κύριος κτλ", *TDNT* III, 1039-1098.
- Forkman, Göran. *The Limits of the Religious Community. Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity*. Tr. Pearl Sjölander. CB NT series 5, Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1972.
- France, R. T., *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher* Grand Rapids: Zondervan 1989.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. "Amtskritik im Matthäus-Evangelium?", *Bib* 54 (1973) 247-62.
- _____. *Jahwebund und Kirche Christi*. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1974.
- _____. "Zur Theologie der Mission im Matthäusevangelium", Karl Kertelge (ed.) *Mission im Neuen Testament* QD 93. Freiburg: Herder, 1982, 93-129.
- Freyne, Seán. *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian. 323 BCE to 135 CE. A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1980.
- _____. *The Twelve: Disciples and Apostles. A Study in the Theology of the First Three Gospels*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968.

- _____. "Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus", in Neusner et al. (eds.) *To See Ourselves*, 117-43.
- Friedrich, G. "κῆρυξ κτλ" *TDNT* III, 683-718.
- _____. "πρόβατον", *EWNT* III, col. 365-68.
- _____ et al. "προφήτης κτλ", *TDNT* VI 781-861.
- Friedrich, Johannes. *Gott im Bruder? Eine methodenkritische Untersuchung von Redaktion, Überlieferung und Traditionen in Mt. 25, 31-46*. CThM 7. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1977.
- Fuchs, Albert. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beiträge zur Quellenkritik*. AnBib 49. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.
- Fuller, Reginald H. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971, 1980.
- _____. *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1965.
- _____. *Interpreting the Miracles*. London: SCM, 1971.
- Fuller, Reginald H. and Perkins, PHEME. *Who Is This Christ? Gospel Christology and Contemporary Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Funk, Robert W. "Beyond Criticism in Quest of Literacy: The Parable of the Leaven", *Int* 25 (1971) 149-70.
- _____. "The Looking-Glass Tree is for the Birds", *Int* 27 (1972) 3-9.
- _____. *Parables and Presence: Forms of the New Testament Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Fusco, Vittorio. "L'Accord Mineur Mt 13, 11a/Lc 8,10a Contre Mk 4,11a", in Joël Delobel (ed.) *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus*. BETL LIX, Leuven: University Press, 1982.
- Gaechter, Paul. *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium*, SBS 7. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, no date.
- Gager, John G. *Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Garland, David E. *The Intention of Matthew 23*, NovTSup 52. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- _____. "Matthew's Understanding of the Temple Tax (Matt 17:24-27)", *SBL 1987 Seminar Papers*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987, 190-209.
- Gärtner, Bertil. "The Habbakuk Commentary (DSH) and the Gospel of Matthew", *ST* 8 (1955) 1-24.
- Garrett, Susan R., "Light on a Dark Subject and Vice Versa: Magic and Magicians in the New Testament" in Neusner et al., *Religion, Science, and Magic: In Concert and Conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Gaston, Lloyd. "The Messiah of Israel as Teacher of the Gentiles: The Setting of Matthew's Christology", *Int* 29 (1975) 24-40.

_____. *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels..* NovTSup 23. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.

Geist, Heinz. *Menschensohn und Gemeinde: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Menschensohnprädikation im Matthäusevangelium.* Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986.

Gerhardsson, Birger. "An ihren Früchten sollt ihr sie erkennen", *EvT* 42 (1982) 113-26.

_____. "Gottes Sohn als Diener Gottes", *ST* 27 (1973) 73-106.

_____. "Jésus Livré et Abandonné d'après la Passion selon saint Matthieu", *RB* 76 (1969) 206-27.

_____. *The Might Acts of Jesus According to Matthew.* Scripta Minora: Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis, 1978-79. Lund: CSK, Gleerup 1979.

_____. "The Parable of the Sower and its Interpretation", *NTS* 14 (1968) 165-93.

_____. "Sacrificial Service and Atonement in the Gospel of Matthew", in R. Banks (ed.) *Reconciliation and Hope.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974, 25-35.

_____. "The Seven Parables in Matthew XIII", *NTS* 19 (1973) 16-37.

_____. *The Testing of God's Son: An Analysis of Early Christian Midrash* (Matt. 4:1-11 pars.) tr. John Toy. CB Series 2:1. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.

Gibbs, James M. "Purpose and Pattern in Matthew's Use of the Title 'Son of David'", *NTS* 10 (1963-4) 446-64.

_____. "The Son of God as the Torah Incarnate in Matthew" *SE IV TU* 102, 38-46.

Giblin, C.H. "A Note on Doubt and Reassurance in Mt 28:16-20" *CBQ* 37 (1975) 68-75.

Giesen, Heinz. *Christliches Handeln: Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zum δίκαιόσυνή Begriff in Matthäus-Evangelium.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1982.

_____. *Glaube und Handeln Band I; Beiträge zur Exegese und Theologie des Matthäus- und Markus- Evangeliums.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983.

Gils, Félix. *Jésus Prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques.* Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957.

Glasson, T. F. "Anti-Pharisaism in St. Matthew", *JQR* 51 (1961-2) 316-20.

Gnilka, Joachim. "Die Kirche des Matthäus und die Gemeinde von Qumran", *BZ* 7 (1963) 43-63.

_____. "Das Kirchenbild im Matthäusevangelium", in *À Cause de l'Évangile. Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes.* Cerf: Publications de Saint-André 1985. LD 123.

- _____. (ed.) *Neues Testament und Kirche*. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.
- _____. "Zur Theologie des Horens nach den Aussagen des Neuen Testaments", *Bibel und Leben* 2 (1961) 71-81.
- _____. *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* StANT 3. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1961.
- _____. "Das Verstockungsproblem nach Matthäus 13, 13-15", in Eckert, *Antijudaismus*.
- de Goedt, M. M. "Jesus Parle Aux Foules en Paraboles". *Assemblées du Seigneur*, vol. 47 (1970) 18-27.
- _____. "L'Explication de la Parabole de l'ivraie", *RB* 66 (1959) 32-54.
- Gollwitzer, Helmut and Traub, Hellmut (eds.). *Hören und Handeln*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962.
- Gooding, D. W. "Structure Littéraire de Matthieu XIII, 53 à XVIII, 35", *RB* 85 (1978) 227-52.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriss der Urgeschichte der Kirche* BFChTh 55. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I*. Tr. John E. Alsup, ed., Jürgen Roloff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament, Vol. II: The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ*. Trans. John E. Alsup, ed. Jürgen Roloff. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. *Typos*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, (1939) 1973.
- Goulder, Michael D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974. The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies 1969-71.
- _____. *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2 vols. JSOTSS 20 Sheffield: JSOT 1989.
- Grässer, Erich. *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien und in der Apostelgeschichte*. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1957.
- Grässer, Erich and Merk, Otto (eds.). *Glaube und Eschatologie*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985.
- _____. "Jesus in Nazareth (Mark VI.1-6a). Notes on the Redaction & Theology of St. Mark.", *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 1-23.
- Grassi, Joseph A. "The Last Testament-Succession: Literary Background of Matthew 9:35-11:1 and its Significance" *BTB* 7 (1977) 172-76.
- Grayston, K. "The Translation of Mt.28.17" *JSNT* 21 (1984) 105-9.
- Green, H. B. "The Command to Baptize and Other Matthaean Interpolations", *SE* 4, *TU* 102 (1968) 60-63.
- _____. "Solomon the Son of David in Matthaean Typology", *SE* 7, *TU* 126 (1982) 227-30.

- _____. "The Structure of St. Matthew's Gospel", *SE* 4, *TU* 102 (1968) 47-59.
- Green, William Scott. "Messiah in Judaism: Rethinking the Question", Introduction to J. Neusner et al., *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: University Press, 1987, 1-13.
- _____. "Palestinian Holy Men: Charismatic Leadership and Rabbinic Tradition", *ANRW* 19:2, 619-47.
- Greeven, Heinrich. "Die Heilung des Gelähmten nach Matthäus", in Lange (ed.) *Matthäus Evangelium*, 205-22.
- Gubler, Marie-Louise. *Die Frühesten Deutungen des Todes Jesu: Eine motivgeschichtliche Darstellung aufgrund der neueren exegetischen Forschung*. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1977.
- Guelich, Robert A. "The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-Requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?", *JBL* 95 (1976) 415-34.
- _____. *The Sermon on the Mount, A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco, Texas: Wood, 1982.
- Gundry, R. H. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel*, *NovTSup* 18 (1967).
- Gutbrod, Walter et al. "Ἰσραήλ", *TDNT* 3, 356-91.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. tr. B. Noble, et al. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- _____. "Matthäus 23", *ZTK* 48 (1951) 38-63.
- _____. *Der Weg Jesu*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.
- Hagner, Donald A. "Apocalyptic Motifs in the Gospel of Matthew: Continuity & Discontinuity", *Horizons in Biblical Theology: An International Dialogue* 7 (1985) 53-82.
- Hahn, F. *Christologische Hoheitstitel: ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964.
- _____. *Mission in the New Testament*. tr. Frank Clarke. London: SCM, 1965.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. *SNTSMS* 6. Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- _____. "The Rejection of the Jews in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts" in A. T. Davies (ed.), *Antisemitism and the Foundations of Christianity*. New York: Paulist, 1979. 27-47.
- _____, and Harrington, Daniel J. "Make Disciples of All the Gentiles (Mt 28:19)", *CBQ* 37 (1975) 359-69.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Light of All Nations: Essays on the Church in N.T. Research*. Wilmington (Delaware): Michael Glazier Good News Studies, vol. 3, 1982.
- _____. "Matthean Studies Since Joachim Rohde", in *Light* 93-109.

- _____. "Sociological Concepts and the Early Church: A Decade of Research" in *Light* 148-61.
- Harrington, Wilfrid J. "The Parables in Recent Study (1960-1971)", *BTB* 2 (1972) 219-41.
- Hartman, Lars. "Ἱεροσόλυμα", *EWNT* 2, cols. 432-39.
- Harvey, A.E. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982.
- Hauck, Friedrich. "περισσεύω κτλ." *TDNT* 6 58-63.
- Hawkins, Sir John. *Horae Synopticae*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.
- Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* SBLMS 18. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.
- Hebert, Gabriel. "The Problem of the Gospel According to Matthew" *SJT* 14 (1961) 403-13.
- Hedinger, Ulrich. "Jesus und die Volksmenge" *T Z* 32 (1976) 201-206.
- Heil, John Paul. *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt. 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21*. An Bib 87. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.
- _____. "Significant Aspects of the Healing Miracles in Matthew" *CBQ* 41 (1979) 274-87.
- Hellholm, David (ed.). *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1983.
- Hempel, J. "Hosanna", *IDB* 2, 648.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Tr. G. Grieg. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981.
- _____. "Zur matthäischen Bergpredigt und ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund", *TR* 52 (1987) 327-400.
- _____. "The Origins of the Christian Mission" in *idem*, *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*. Tr. John Bowden. London SCM, 1983, 48-64.
- Herford, R. Travers. *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. Clifton: Reference Book Publishers, 1966.
- Hesse, Franz. *Das Verstockungsproblem in alten Testament*. BZAW 74. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1955.
- Hiers, Richard H. *Jesus and the Future*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- _____. *The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1970.
- Higgins, A.J.B. (ed.). *New Testament Essays*. Manchester: Univeristy Press, 1959.

Hill, David. "The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel: Some Literary-Critical Observations", *IBS* 8 (1986) 54-63.

_____. "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΙ as a Quasi-technical Term" *NTS* 11 (1964-65) 296-302.

_____. "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Response to Professor Kingsbury's Literary Critical Probe", *JSNT* 21 (1984) 37-52.

_____. "In Quest of Matthean Christology", *IBS* 8 (1986) 135-42.

_____. "Jesus and Josephus' 'Messianic prophets'" in Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson (eds.) *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*, Cambridge: University Press, 1979. 143-54.

_____. *New Testament Prophecy*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.

_____. "On the Use and Meaning of Hosea VI.6 in Matthew's Gospel", *NTS* 24 (1978) 107-19.

_____. "Some Recent Trends in Matthean Studies", *Irish Biblical Studies* 1 (1979) 139-49.

_____. "Son and Servant: An Essay on Matthean Christology", *JSNT* 6 (1980) 2-16.

Hoffman, P. *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. NTAbh 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.

Hoffman, Paul et al. (eds.). *Orientierung an Jesus*. Freiburg: Herder, 1973.

Hoh, J. "Der christliche γραμματεὺς (Mt. 13:52)", *BZ* 17 (1926) 256-79.

Hooker, Morna D. "Uncomfortable Words X. Prohibition of Foreign Missions (Mt 10:5-6)" *ET* 82, (1971) 361-65.

Horbury, William. "The Temple Tax", in Bammel and Moule (eds.) *Politics*, 265-86.

_____. "The Benediction of the *Minim* and early Jewish-Christian Controversy", *JTS* 33 (1982) 19-61.

Horsley, Richard A. "Like One of the Prophets of Old: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus", *CBQ* 47 (1985) 435-63.

_____. "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins", *JSNT* 26 (1986) 3-27.

Horst, P.W. van der, "Once More: The Translation of οἱ δὲ in Matthew 28.17" *JSNT* 27 (1986) 27-30

Hubbard, Benjamin J. *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20*. SBLDS 19. Missoula: SBL & Scholars Press, 1974.

Hübner, Hans. *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition*. 2. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973, 1986.

Huffman, Norman A. "Atypical Features in the Parables of Jesus", *JBL* 97 (1978) 207-20.

- Hull, John M. *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*. SBT 28. London: SCM, 1974.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *Jesus and his Adversaries: the Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979.
- Hummel, R. *Die Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kirche und Judentum in Matthäus-Evangelium*. 2. Aufl., 1966. BevTh 33. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- Hurtado, Larry W. "The Study of New Testament Christology: Notes for the Agenda", in K. H. Richards (ed.) *SBL 1981 Seminar Papers*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981, 185-97.
- Iersel, B. Van "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition", *NovT* 7 (1964/5) 167-94.
- Ittel, Gerhard Wolfgang. *Jesus und die Jünger*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1970.
- Jackson, F. Foakes and Lake, Kirsopp. *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. I, Prolegomena I: The Jewish, Gentile and Christian Backgrounds. London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Jacobson, Delmar. "An Exposition of Matthew 13:44-52", *Int* 29 (1975) 277-82.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Tr. F.H. and C.H. Cave. London: SCM, 1969.
- . *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. Tr. S. H. Hooke, SBT 24. London: SCM, 1958. (*Jesu Verheissung für die Völker*. 2. Aufl. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1956.)
- . "Die Muttersprache des Evangelisten Matthäus", *ZNW* (1959) 270-74.
- . 'Μωυσης', *TWNT* 4, 852-78..
- Johnson, Marshall D. *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*, SNTSMS 8. Cambridge: University Press, (1969).
- . "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology", *CBQ* 36 (1974) 44-64.
- Johnson, Sherman E. "The Biblical Quotations in Matthew", *HTR* 36 (1943) 135-53.
- . "The Davidic-Royal Motif in the Gospels", *JBL* 87 (1968) 136-50.
- Johnston, George. "ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗ and ΚΟΣΜΟΣ in the New Testament", *NTS* 10 (1963-4) 352-60.
- Jouon, P. "ΟΧΛΟΣ Au Sens de 'Peuple, Population' dans le Grec du Nouveau Testament et dans la Lettre d'Aristée", *RSR* 27 (1937) 618-19.
- Jülicher, D. Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Gleichnisreden der drei ersten Evangelien*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1899.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology", tr. W. J. Montague, *New Testament Questions of Today*. London: SCM, 1969, 82-107.

- _____. *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967.
- _____. "Matthäus 15:1-14", *Exegetische Versuche I*, 237-41.
- _____. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Tr. W. J. Montague. London: SCM, 1965.
- _____. "Das Problem des historischen Jesus", tr. W. J. Montague, *New Testament Questions of Today*. London: SCM, 1969.
- Kahlefeld, Heinrich. *Gleichnisse und Lehrstücke im Evangelium*. Einbändige Sonderausgabe, 1981. Frankfurt: Verlag Josef Knecht, 1963.
- Kampling, Rainer. *Das Blut Christi und die Juden: Mt 27:25 bei den lateinischsprachigen christlichen. Autoren bis zu Leo den Grossen*. NTAbh 16. Münster: Aschendorff, 1984.
- Karpinski, Richard. *ΕΞΟΥΣΙΑ· 'A la Base de l'Enseignement de Jésus et de la Mission Apostolique Selon S. Matthieu*. Rome: Institut des Recherches Ecclésiastiques, 1961.
- Kasting, Heinrich. *Die Anfänge der Urchristlichen Mission: Ein historische Untersuchung*. BevTh 55. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1969.
- Kastner, P. Josef M. *Moses im Neuen Testament*. Inaugural Dissertation: Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München, 1967.
- Katz, Steven T. "Issues in the Separation of Judaism and Christianity after 70 C.E: A Reconsideration", *JBL* 103 (1984) 43-76.
- Kealy, Sean P. "The Modern Approach to Matthew", *BTB* 9 (1979) 165-78.
- Kee, Howard C. *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective*. London: SCM, 1980.
- _____. "Magic and Messiah", in *Religion, Learning, and Magic in Christianity*, 121-41.
- _____. *Medicine, Miracle and Magic in New Testament Times*. SNTSMS 55. Cambridge: University Press, 1986.
- Keegan, Terence J. "Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses", *CBQ* 44 (1982) 415-25.
- Kennard, J. Spencer, Jr. "'Hosanna' and the Purpose of Jesus" *JBL* 67 (1948) 171-76.
- Kermode, Frank. *The Genesis of Secrecy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Kertelge, K. (ed.) *Das Kirchliche Amt im Neuen Testament*. Wege der Forschung CDXXXIX. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977.
- Kessler, Hans. *Die Theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. Dusseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1970.
- Kiddle, M. "The Conflict Between the Disciples, the Jews and the Gentiles in St. Matthew's Gospel", *JTS* 36 (1935) 33-44.

Kilpatrick, G.D. *The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean. "The Composition and Christology of Matt. 28:16-20", *JBL* 93 (1974) 573-84.

_____. "The Developing Conflict between Jews and the Jewish Leaders in Matthew's Gospel: A Literary Critical Study", *CBQ* 49 (1987) 57-73.

_____. "The Figure of Jesus in Matthew's Story: A Literary Critical Probe", *JSNT* 21 (1984) 3-36.

_____. "The Figure of Peter in Matthew's Gospel as a Theological Problem", *JBL* 98 (1979) 67-83.

_____. "Form and Message of Matthew", *Int* 29 (1975) 13-23.

_____. *Matthew as Story*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

_____. *Matthew: Structure, Christology and Kingdom*. London: SPCK, 1976.

_____. "Observations on the 'Miracle Chapters' of Matthew 8-9", *CBQ* 40 (1978) 559-73.

_____. "On Following Jesus: the 'Eager' Scribe and the 'Reluctant' Disciple, Matthew 8:18-22", *NTS* 34 (1988) 45-59.

_____. *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13: A Study in Redaction-Criticism*. London: SPCK, 1969.

_____. "Reflections on 'the Reader' of Matthew's Gospel", *NTS* 34 (1988) 442-60.

_____. "The Structure of Matthew's Gospel and His Concept of Salvation History", *CBQ* 35 (1973) 451-74.

_____. "The Title 'KYRIOS' in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 94 (1975) 246-55.

_____. "The Title 'Son of David' in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 95 (1976) 591-602.

_____. "The Title 'Son of Man' in Matthew's Gospel", *CBQ* 37 (1975) 193-202.

_____. "The Verb AKOLOUTHEIN ('to follow') as an Index of Matthew's View of his Community", *JBL* 97 (1978) 56-73.

Kittel, Gerhard. 'ἀκολουθέω', *TDNT* 1, 210-16.

_____. "δοκέω, κτλ.", *TDNT* II, 232-55.

Klappert, B. "King", *NIDNTT* 2.

Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.

_____. "Die Frage der Sündenvergebung in der Perikope von der Heilung des Gelähmten" (Mk 2:1-12 parr.). *BZ* 25 (1981) 223-48.

- Klein, Hans. "Das Glaubenverständnis im Matthäusevangelium", in F. Hahn and H. Klein (eds.) *Glaube im Neuen Testament*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 7. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1982, 29-42.
- Klijn, A.F.J. "Scribes, Pharisees, Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament", *NovT* 3 (1959) 259-67.
- Knox, John. "The 'Prophet' in New Testament Christology", in R.A. Norris, Jr. (ed.) *Lux in Lumine: Essays to Honor W. Norman Pittenger*. New York: Seabury Press, 1966, 23-34.
- Knox, Wilfred. *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels, vol. II: St. Luke & St. Matthew*. H. Chadwick (ed.). Cambridge: University Press, 1957.
- Kodell, Jerome. "Luke's use of *Laos* 'People' especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19:28-24:53)", *CBQ* 31 (1969) 327-43.
- Koester, H. "σπλάγχνον κτλ" *TDNT* VII, 548-549.
- Kolenkow, Anita Bingham. "Healing Controversy as a Tie between Miracle and Passion Material for a Proto-gospel", *JBL* 95 (1976) 623-38.
- Kopp, Clemens. *Die Heiligen Stätten der Evangelien*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1959.
- Kosmala, H. "His Blood on Us and on Our Children (the Background of Matt. 27:24-25)", *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (in Jerusalem)* 7 (1970) 94-126.
- Kratz, Reinhard. *Auferweckung als Befreiung: Eine Studie zur Passions- und Auferstehungstheologie des Matthäus*. SBS 65. Stuttgart: KBW Verlag, 1973.
- Krentz, Edgar. "Community and Character: Matthew's View of the Church", *SBL* 1987 Seminar Papers. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987, 565-73.
- . "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue: Toward the Structure of the First Gospel", *JBL* 83 (1964) 409-14.
- Kretzer, Armin. *Die Herrschaft der Himmel und die Söhne des Reiches: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Basileabegriff und Basileaverständnis im Matthäusevangelium*, SBM 10. Stuttgart: Echter KBW, 1971.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Tr. Howard Clark Kee, 17th rev. ed. London: SCM, 1975. (*Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 17. Aufl. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1973.)
- . *Promise and Fulfillment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*, tr. Dorothea M. Barton, SBT 23 London: SCM, 1957.
- . *Theology of the New Testament*, tr. John E. Steely. London: SCM, 1974.
- . "Die Wehrufe über die Schriftgelehrten und Pharisäer (Matthäus 23:13-36)", in Eckert, 'Antijudaismus' 135-47.
- Künzel, Georg. *Studien zum Gemeindeverständnis des Matthäus-Evangeliums*, CThM. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1978.

- Kuhn, K. G. "προσήλυτος", *TDNT* 6, 727-44.
- _____. "σταυρώω", *EWNT* 3, cols. 646-49.
- Kuss, Otto. "Zum Sinngehalt des Doppelgleichnisses vom Senfkorn und Sauerteig", *Biblica* 40 (1959) 641-53.
- _____. "Zur Senfkornparabel". *Theologie und Glaube* 41 (1951) 40-46.
- Kwaak, H. van der. "Die Klage über Jerusalem (Mt. 23:37-39)", *NovT* 8 (1966) 156-70.
- Lachs, Samuel Tobias. *A Rabbinic Commentary on the New Testament: The Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke*. Hoboken: KTAV Publishing House, 1987.
- Ladd, George Eldon. "The Life Setting of the Parables of the Kingdom", *JBL* 31 (1963) 193-99.
- _____. "The Sitz im Leben of the Parables of Matthew 13: the Soils", *SE II, TU* 87 (1964) 203-10.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "ἐξίστημι" *EWNT* II: cols. 17-19.
- _____. *Ich Aber Sage Euch: Die Bergpredigt als programatische Rede Jesu Mt 5-7, Lk 6:20-49*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.
- Lamnes, Klaus. *Hören, Sehen und Glauben im Neuen Testament*, SBS 11. Stuttgart: KBW, 1967.
- Lange, Joachim. *Das Erscheinen des Auferstandenen im Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1973.
- _____. (ed.) *Das Matthäus-Evangelium*. Wege der Forschung Band 525. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.
- LaVerdière, Eugene A. and Thompson, William G. "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke", *Theological Studies* 37 (1976) 567-97.
- Lebram, Jürgen. "ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ", in Otto Betz, M. Hengel, Peter Schmidt (eds.), *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel*. AGSU V. Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- Légasse, S. "L'antijudaïsme dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu" in *L'Évangile*, 417-28.
- _____. "Les Miracles de Jésus selon Matthieu" in Leon-Dufour, *Miracles*. 227-47.
- _____. "Scribes et Disciples de Jésus" *RB* 68 (1961) 321-45, 481-506.
- Legrand, L. "The Harvest is Plentiful (Mt. 9:37)", *Scripture* 17 (1965) 1-9.
- Leon-Dufour, Xavier. *Études d'Évangile*. Paris: Le Seuil, 1965.
- _____. *Les miracles de Jésus selon le Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1977.
- _____. "Mt et Mc dans le Récit de la Passion", *Biblica* 40 (1959) 684-86.

- _____. "Passion (Récits de la) cols. 1419-1492" *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément VI. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1960.
- Leroy, Herbert. *Zur Vergebung der Sünden. Die Botschaft der Evangelien*. SBS 73. Stuttgart: KBW, 1974.
- Lightfoot, Robert Henry. *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*. The Brampton Lectures 1934. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *Jesus, Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research*. London: SPCK, 1983.
- _____. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM, 1961.
- Lindars, Barnabas and Smalley, Stephen S. (eds.). *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1973.
- Loader, W.R.C. "Son of David, Blindness, Possession, and Duality in Matthew", *CBQ* 44 (1982) 570-85.
- Lövestam, Evald. "Jésus Fils de David chez le Synoptiques", tr. L. M. Dewailly, *ST* 28 (1974) 97-109.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. "Wem gilt die Bergpredigt?" *TQ* 163 (1983) 264-84, 266 #13.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1936.
- Lohr, Charles H. "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew", *CBQ* 23 (1961) 403-35.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Die Gottesherrschaft in den Gleichnissen Jesu", *Evangelische Theologie* 18 (1958) 145-57.
- _____. "Hosianna", *NovT* 6 (1963) 113-19.
- _____. "Der König aus Davids Geschlecht. Bemerkungen zur messianischen Erwartung der Synagoge". O. Betz et al. *Abraham* 337-45.
- _____. "Σιών κτλ", *TDNT* 7 319-38.
- _____. "ὡσαννά", *TDNT* 9 682-84.
- Lohse, Eduard, et al. (eds.). *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1970.
- Loos, H. van der. *The Miracles of Jesus*. NovTSup 8. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Luck, Ulrich. *Die Vollkommenheitsforderung der Bergpredigt: Ein aktuelles Kapitel der Theologie des Matthäus*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1968.
- Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. WMANT 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1969.
- _____. "Jesus und Seine Propheten: Gesprächsbeitrag", in J. Panagopoulos, *Vocation*., 210-17.

- Lund, N.W. "The Influence of Chiasmus upon the Structure of the Gospel According to Matthew", *ATR* 13 (1931) 405-33.
- Luz, U. "The Disciples in the Gospel According to Matthew", in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 98-128.
- _____. "Jesus und die Pharisäer", *Judaica* 38 (1982) 229-46.
- Maccoby, H. Z. "Jesus and Barabbas", *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 55-60.
- Maisch, Ingrid. *Die Heilung des Gelähmten*. SBS 52. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. "Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers", *NovT* 28 (1986) 104-30.
- Malina, Bruce J. "The Literary Structure and Form of Matt. xxviii.16-20", *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 87-103.
- Manigne, Jean-Pierre. "Il ne leur parlait pas sans paraboles", *Vie Spirituelle* 58 (1976) 484-91.
- Manson, T. W. *Only to the House of Israel?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.
- _____. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM (1937) 1964.
- _____. *Teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.
- Marguerat, Daniel. "L'Église et le Monde en Matthieu 13:36-43", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 110 (1978) 111-29.
- _____. "L'Existence Chrétienne selon Matthieu", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 110 (1978) 291-99.
- _____. *Le Jugement dans l'évangile de Matthieu, Le Monde de la Bible*. Editions Labor et Fides, 1981.
- Marin, Louis. "Essai d'Analyse Structurale d'un Récit. Parole: Matthieu 13:1-23", *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 46 (1971) 35-74.
- Martin Jr., Albert William. *The Interpretation of the Triumphal Entry in the Early Church*. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Vanderbilt University Ph.D., 1971.
- Martin, Brice L. "Matthew on Christ and the Law", *ST* 44 (1983) 53-70.
- Martin, Francis. "The Image of the Shepherd in the Gospel of Saint Matthew", *Science et Esprit* XXVII (1975) 261-301.
- Martin, James P. "The Church in Matthew", *Int* 29 (1975) 41-56.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, 2nd Ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1979.
- Matera, Frank J. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories*. Theological Inquiries. New York: Paulist Press, 1986.

- McArthur, Harvey K. "The Parable of the Mustard Seed", *CBQ* 33 (1971) 198-210.
- McConnell, R.S. *Law and Prophecy in Matthew's Gospel*. Basel, 1969.
- McKay, K.L. "The Use of *Hoi de* in Matthew 28.17. A Response to K. Grayston" *JSNT* 24 (1985) 71-72.
- McNamara, Martin. *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. AnBib 27a. Rome: Biblica Institute Press, 1978.
- McNeile, A.H. "Tóte in St. Matthew", *JTS* 12 (1910-11) 127-28.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Am I a Jew?" - Johannine Christianity & Judaism", in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part One: New Testament*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, 163-86.
- . "Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities", in Neusner, et al., *To See Ourselves*, 93-115.
- . *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- . "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism", *JBL* 91 (1972) 44-72.
- . *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Library of Early Christianity 6. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- . *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. NovTSup. 14. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- . "Social Functions of Apocalyptic Language in Pauline Christianity" in David Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism*. 687-705.
- Meier, John P. "John the Baptist in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 99 (1980) 383-405.
- . *Law and History in Matthew's Gospel: A Redactional Study of Mt 5:17-48*, AnBib 71: Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- . "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19?" *CBQ* 39 (1977) 94-102.
- . "Salvation-History in Matthew: In Search of a Starting Point" *CBQ* 37 (1975) 203-15.
- . "Two Disputed Questions in Matt. 28:16-20" *JBL* 96 (1977) 407-24.
- . *The Vision of Matthew: Christ, Church and Morality in the First Gospel*. Theological Inquiries. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Mellon, Christian. "La Parabole: Manière de parler, manière d'entendre" *Recherches de Science Religieuses* 61 (1973) 49-63.
- Merkel, Helmut. "Jesus und die Pharisäer" *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 194-208.
- Merklein, Helmut. *Jesu Botschaft von der Gottesherrschaft: Ein Skizze*, SBS 111. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.
- Meye, Robert P. *Jesus and the Twelve: Discipleship and Revelation in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

Meyer, Rudolf. "Der 'Am hā-'Ares. Ein Beitrag zur Religionssoziologie Palästinas im ersten und zweiten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert" *Judaica* 3 (1947) 169-99.

_____. "ὄχλος" *TDNT* 5, 582-90.

_____. *Der Prophet aus Galiläa: Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelisten*. Leipzig, 1940.

Meynet, Roland. "Qui Donc est 'Le Plus Fort'? Analyse Rhétorique de Mc 3, 22-30; Mt 12, 22-37; Luc 11, 14-26", *RB* 90 (1983) 334-50.

Michaels, Ramsay J. "Christian Prophecy and Matthew 23:8-12; A Test Exegesis". *SBL Seminar Papers* (1976). Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976, 305-10.

Michel, Otto. "The Conclusion of Matthew's Gospel: A Contribution to the History of the Easter Message", in Stanton, *Interpretation*, 30-41.

_____. "'Diese Kleinen'. Eine Jüngerbezeichnung Jesu", *Theologisch Studien und Kritiken*, NF 3 (1937-38) 401-15.

_____. "Menschensohn und Volkerwelt", *Evangelische Missions Zeitschrift* 2 (1941) 257-67.

Miner, Paul S. "Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology", Baltensweiler, *Neues Testament und Geschichte*. 79-90.

_____. "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew", *ATR* supp. ser. 3 (1974) 28-44.

_____. "False Prophecy and Hypocrisy in the Gospel of Matthew" in Joachim Gnllka (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche*. Freiburg: Herder, 1974, 76-93.

_____. *Images of the Church in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.

_____. "Jesus' Audiences According to Luke", *NovT*. 16 (1974) 81-109.

_____. *Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1982.

Mitton, C. Leslie. "New Wine in Old Wine Skins: IV. Leaven" *ET* 84 (1973) 339-43.

Mohrlang, Roger. *Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives*, SNTSMS 48. Cambridge: University Press, 1984.

Montefiore, C. G. *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1930.

_____. *The Synoptic Gospels*, vol. II, C. G. Montefiore (ed.), 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1927.

Moore, George F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, 2 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

_____. "Nazarene and Nazareth", Appendix B in F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, vol. I Prolegomena I: The Jewish, Gentile and Christian Backgrounds*. London: Macmillan, 1920, 426-32.

- Mora, Vincent. *Le Refus d'Israël Matthieu, 27:25*. LD 124. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1986.
- Morgan, Robert with John Barton. *Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Mosley, A. W. "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke", *NTS* 10 (1963-64) 139-49.
- Motyer, J. A. "'ὡσαννά' s.v. Amen", *NIDNTT* I, 100.
- Moule, C.F.D. *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3rd ed., Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black (1966), 1981.
- . "The Function of the Synoptic Gospels", in Erich Grässer and Otto Monk (eds.), *Glaube und Eschatologie*. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr, 1985, 199-208.
- . "The Intention of the Evangelists", in A.J.B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essays*. Manchester: University Press, 1959, 164-79.
- . *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: University Press, 1977.
- . "St. Matthew's Gospel: Some Neglected Features", *SE* 2, *TU* 87 (1964) 91-9.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh*, tr. G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.
- Mundle, W. "ἔκστασις", s.v. Ecstasy, etc. *NIDNTT* I., 527-28.
- . "Fear, Awe". *NIDNTT* I, 621-24.
- . "θαῦμα", s.v. Miracle, etc. *NIDNTT* II, 620-26.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Structure of Matthew 14-17", *RB* 82 (1975) 360-84.
- Mussner, Franz. "Die bösen Winzer nach Matthäus 21, 33-46", in Eckert, *Antijudaismus*, 129-34.
- Neirynck, Frans. *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: with a cumulative list*. BETL 37. Leuven: University Press, 1974.
- . "La Rédaction Matthéenne et la Structure du Premier Évangile", *ETL* 43 (1967) 41-73.
- Nepper-Christensen, Poul. *Das Matthäusevangelium: Ein judenchristliches Evangelium?* Acta Theologica Danica I, Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget 1, 1958.
- Neusner, Jacob (ed.). *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- . "The Fellowship (הַבְּרִיחַ) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth", *HTR* 53 (1960) 125-42.
- . "The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavweh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100", *ANRW* 19:2, 3-42.

- _____. *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1984.
- _____. *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- _____. *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*. 3 vols., Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- _____. (ed.). "To See Ourselves as Others See Us", Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Neusner, Jacob, William Scott Green and Ernest S. Frerichs, (eds.). *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*. Cambridge: University Press, 1987.
- Newman, Barclay M. "To Teach or Not to Teach (A Comment on Matthew 13:1-3)", *Bible Translator* (1983) vol. 34:1, 139-43.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. *Christ is Community: The Christologies of the New Testament*. Good News Studies 13. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1985.
- _____. "The Thematic Use of Isaiah 42, 1-4 in Matthew 12" *Biblica* 63 (1982) 457-73.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism", in Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism*, 641-54.
- Nolan, Brian M. *The Royal Son of God: the Christology of Matthew 1-2 in the Setting of the Gospel*. OBO 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979.
- Norris, R.A., Jr. (ed.). *Lux in Lumine*. New York: Seabury Press, 1966.
- Normann, Friedrich. *Christos Didaskalos: Die Vorstellung von Christus als Lehrer in der christlichen Literatur des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie Heft 32. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.
- Norris, Jr., R.A. (ed.). *Lux in Lumine*. New York: Seabury Press, 1966.
- North, Christopher R. *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah: An Historical and Critical Study*. Oxford: University Press, (1956) 1969.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "ἔκστασις, ἐξίστημι" *TDNT* II 449-60.
- Ogawa, Akira. *L'histoire de Jésus chez Matthieu: La signification de l'histoire pour la théologie Matthéenne*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1979.
- Oppenheimer, Aharon. *The 'Am Ha-Aretz': A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*, Tr. D. Levine. ALGHJ 8. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Pamment, Margaret. "The Kingdom of Heaven According to the First Gospel", *NTS* 27 (1981) 211-32.
- _____. "The Son of Man in the First Gospel", *NTS* 29, 116-29.
- Panagopoulos, J. (ed.). *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*. NovTSup 45. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.

- Parker, S. Thomas. "The Decapolis Reviewed", *JBL* 94 (1975) 437-41.
- Patsch, Hermann. "Der Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem" *ZTK* 68 (1976) 1-26.
- Pedersen, Siegfried. "Die Proklamation Jesu als des eschatologischen Offenbarungsträgers (Mt 17:1-13)", *NovT* 17 (1975) 241-64.
- Perels, Otto. *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihrem Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung*. BWANT 12. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1934.
- Perrin, Norman. *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1963.
- _____. *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1967.
- _____. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Perrot, Charles. "Un prophète comme l'un des prophètes (Mc 6:15)" in Maurice Carrez et al. (eds.), *De la Torah au Messie*. Paris: Desclée (1981), 417-23.
- Percy, Ernst. *Die Botschaft Jesu*. Lund: Gleerup, 1953.
- Pesch, Rudolf. "Der Gottessohn im matthäischen Evangelienprolog (Mt 1-2): Beobachtungen zu den Zitationsformeln der Reflexionszitate." *Biblica* 48 (1967) 395-420.
- Pesch, Wilhelm. "Theologische Aussagen der Redaktion von Matthias 23", in Paul Hoffmann with Norbert Broy and Wilhelm Pesch (eds.), *Orientierung An Jesus, Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*. Freiburg: Henke, 1973, 280-99.
- Phillips, Gary Allen. *Enunciation and the Kingdom of Heaven: Text, Narration and Hermeneutic in the Parables of Matthew 13*. 1981 Ph.D. dissertation for Vanderbilt University. Ann Arbor: University Microfilm International, 1981.
- _____. "History and Text: the Reader in Context in Matthew's Parables Discourse", *SBL Seminar Papers*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983, 415-37.
- Piper, Ronald A. *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*. SNTSMS 61. Cambridge: University Press, 1989.
- Pokorny, Petr. "The Temptation Stories and Their Intention", *NTS* 20 (1974) 115-27.
- Polag, Athanasius. *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*. WMANT 45. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1977.
- _____. *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle*. Neukirchner-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag 1979.
- Porton, Gary G. "Diversity in Postbiblical Judaism", Robert A. Kraft and George V.F. Nickelsburg (eds.), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, 57-80.
- Prabhu, George M. Soares. *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew*. AnBib 63. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Preisker, Herbert and Schulz, Siegfried. "πρόβατον, προβ άτιον" *TDNT* VI 688-92.

- Przybylski, Bruno. *Righteousness in Matthew and his World of Thought* SNTSMS 41. Cambridge: University Press, 1980.
- . "The Setting of Matthean Anti-judaism", in Richardson, *Antijudaism* I, 181-200.
- Ramaroson, Léonard. "La structure du premier Évangile", *Science et Esprit* 26 (1974) 69-112.
- Remus, Harold E. "Sociology of Knowledge and the Study of Early Christianity", *SR* 11 (1982) 45-56.
- Rengstorff, Karl. "διδάσκω κτλ", *TDNT* II, 135-48.
- Reventlow, H. Graf. "Volk", *BHH* 3:2112.
- Rhoads, David and Michie, Donald. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Richardson, Peter. *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. SNTSMS 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Richardson, Peter and Granskou, David (eds.). *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity*. Vol. I, Paul and the Gospels, Vol. II, Studies in Christianity and Judaism. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier U.P., 1986.
- Riches, John. *Jesus and the Transformation of Judaism*. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1980.
- . "The Sociology of Matthew: Some Basic Questions Concerning its Relation to the Theology of the New Testament", *SBL Seminar Papers* (1983) 259-71.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. *Jésus Transfiguré: L'Arrière-Plan de Récit Évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur*. ASNU XVI. København: Ejnar Munksgaard 1947.
- Riesner, Rainer. *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. Inaugural-Dissertation, Tübingen, 1980.
- Rigaux, Bédé. *Temoignage de l'Évangile de Matthieu: Pour une histoire de Jésus II*. Desclee de Brouwer, 1967.
- Rist, John M. *On the Independence of Matthew & Mark*. SNTSMS 32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Rivkin, Ellis. *A Hidden Revolution*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1978.
- Rohde, Joachim. *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. Tr. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- Rolland, P. "From the Genesis to the End of the World: The Plan of Matthew's Gospel", *BTB* 2 (1972) 155-76.
- Rothfuchs, W. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. WMANT V 8. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969.

Rüger, Hans Peter. "ΝΑΖΑΡΕΘ/ΝΑΖΑΡΑ ΝΑΖΑΡΗΝΟΣ/ΝΑΖΩΡΑΙΟΣ" *ZNW* 72 (1981) 257-63.

Russell, E. A. "'Antisemitism' in the Gospel of Matthew", *IBS* 8 (1986) 183-96.

———. "The Image of the Jew in Matthew's Gospel", *SE VII, TU* 126 (1982) 428-42.

Ryan, Thomas J. "Matthew 15:29-31: An Overlooked Summary", *Horizons* 5 (1978) 31-42.

Sabourin, Leopold. "The Parables of the Kingdom" *BTB* 6 (1976) 115-60.

———. "Traits Apocalyptiques dans L'Évangile de Matthieu", *Science et Esprit* 33 (1981) 357-72.

Saito, Tadashi. *Die Mosevorstellungen im Neuen Testament*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Reihe xxiii, Bd. 100. Bern/Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1977.

Sand, Alexander. *Das Gesetz und die Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus*. Biblische Untersuchungen II. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1974.

———. "Die Polemik gegen 'Gesetzlosigkeit' im Evangelium nach Matthäus und bei Paulus" *BZ* 14 (1970) 112-25.

———. "Propheten, Weise und Schriftkündige in der Gemeinde des Matthäusevangeliums" in J. Hainz (ed.) *Kirche im Werden. Studien zum Thema Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament*. München: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1976.

———. *Reich Gottes und Eheverzicht im Evangelium nach Matthäus*. SBS 109. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983.

Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM, 1985.

———. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM Press, 1990.

———. *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. SNTSMS 9, Cambridge: University Press, 1969.

Sanders, E. P. and Davies, Margaret. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London: SCM Press, 1989.

Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM, 1982.

Sandmel, Samuel. *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*. Cincinnati: Hebrew University College Press, 1956.

Schaberg, Jane. *The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. The Triadic Phrase in Matthew 28:19b*. SBLDS 61. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.

Schäfer, Peter. *Geschichte der Juden in der Antike: Die Juden Palästinas von Alexander dem Grossen bis zur arabischen Eroberung*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk / Neukirchner, 1983.

Schenk, Wolfgang. *Die Sprache des Matthäus: Die Texte-Konstituenten in ihren makro- und mikrostrukturellen Relationen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1987.

_____. "Das Präsens Historicum als Makrosyntaktisches Gliederungssignal im Matthäusevangelium", *NTS* 22 (1975-76) 464-75.

_____. "Den Menschen Mt 9:8", *ZNW* 54 (1963) 272-75.

Schille, G. "Δεκαπόλις", *EWNT* I cols. 681-2.

Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur Ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.

Schmithals, Walter. *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten" *SE I, TU* (1963) 622-39.

_____. *God's Rule and Kingdom*. tr. John Murray. Nelson: Edinburgh, 1963.

Schneider, Gerhard. *Die Passion Jesu nach den drei älteren Evangelien*. Biblische Handbibliothek xi. München: Kösel Verlag, 1973.

Schneider, Johannes. "σταυρός κτλ", *TDNT* 7 572-84.

Schnider, Franz. *Jesus der Prophet*. OBO 2. Universitätsverlag Freiburg. Göttingen: Verlag & Ruprecht, 1973.

Schoeps, H.J. "Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde". *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, 2. Uppsala: Wretmans Boktryckeri A.-B., 1943, 126-43.

Schönle, Johannes. *Jesus und die Juden. Die Theologische Position des Matthäus und des Verfassers der Redenquelle im Lichte von Mt. 11*. *BBET* 17. Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1982.

Schrage, Wolfgang. "τυφλός, τυφλόω" *TDNT* 8, 270-94.

Schreiner, Josef and Gerhard Dautzenburg (eds.) *Gestalt und Ansprüche des Neuen Testaments*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1969.

Schulz, Anton. *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen. Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentliche Jüngerschaft zur urchristlichen Vorbildethik*. *StANT* VI. München: Kösel Verlag, 1962.

Schulz, Siegfried. *Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

_____. *Die Stunde der Botschaft. Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten*. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 BC-AD 135)*. Rev. ed., G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, 4 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979-87.

Schürmann, Heinz. "Mt 10, 5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des Synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes", *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Beiträge Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1967, 137-49.

- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. tr. W. Montgomery. London: SCM, 1981.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Er wird Nazoräer heissen", *Neotestamentica: Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963*; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963.
- _____. *Lordship and Discipleship*. SBT 28. London: SCM, 1960.
- _____. "The 'Matthean' Church", *NTS* 20 (1974) 216.
- _____. *Matthäus und seine Gemeinde*. SBS 71. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1974.
- _____. "Observance of the Law and Charismatic Activity in Matthew", *NTS* 16 (1969-70) 213-30.
- _____. "Zur Sondertradition der Gleichnisse bei Matthäus", J. Jeremias (ed.) *Tradition und Glaube. Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971, 277-82.
- Scott, Brandon Bernard. *Jesus, Symbol Maker for the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Scroggs, Robin. "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement", J. Neusner, (ed.) *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults. Part II* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, 1-23.
- _____. "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research", *NTS* 26 (1980) 164-79.
- Segal, Alan F. *Rebecca's Children: Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- Segbroeck, F. van. "Les citations d'accomplissement dans l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu d'après trois ouvrages récents", in Didier, *L'Évangile*, 107-30.
- _____. "Jésus rejeté par sa patrie", *Biblica* 49 (1968) 167-98.
- _____. "Le scandale de l'incroyance: la signification de Mt 13:35", *ETL* 41 (1965) 344-72.
- Segovia, Fernando (ed.). *Discipleship in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Senior, Donald P. "The Ministry of Continuity: Matthew's Gospel and the Interpretation of History", *Bible Today* 82 (1976) 670-76.
- _____. *The Passion Narrative According to Matthew: A Redactional Study*, BETL 39. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975.
- _____. "The Passion Narrative in the Gospel of Matthew", in Didier (ed.), *L'Évangile* 343-57.
- Sheridan, Mark. "Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke", *BTB* 3 (1973) 235-55.
- Shuler, Philip L. *A Genre for the Gospels: The Biographical Character of Matthew*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

- Sider, John W. "The Meaning of *Parabole* in the Usage of the Synoptic Evangelists", *Biblica* 62 (1981) 453-70.
- _____. "Proportional Analogy in the Gospel Parables", *NTS* 31 (1985) 1-23.
- _____. "Rediscovering the Parables: The Logic of the Jeremias Tradition", *JBL* 102 (1983) 61-83.
- Siegmán, Edward F. "Teaching in Parables", *CBQ* 23 (1961) 161-81.
- Slater, Tommy B. "Notes on Matthew's Structure", *JBL* 99 (1980) 436.
- Slingerland, H. Dixon. "The Transjordanian Origin of St. Mathew's Gospel", *JSNT* 3 (1979) 18-28.
- Smend, Rudolf and Luz, Ulrich. *Gesetz. Biblische Konfrontationen* (Bd. 1015). Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1981.
- Smith, Charles W.F. "The Mixed State of the Church in Matthew's Gospel", *JBL* 82 (1963) 149-68.
- Smith, Morton. *Jesus the Magician*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants. An Inquiry into Parabolic Interpretation*. WUNT 27. Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1983.
- Stanton, Graham. "Aspects of Early Christian-Jewish Polemic and Apologetic", *NTS* 31 (1985) 377-92.
- _____. "The Gospel of Matthew and Judaism", *BJRL* 66 (1984) 264-84.
- _____. *The Interpretation of Matthew*, Tr. R. Morgan et al. Issues in Religion and Theology 3. London: SPCK, 1983.
- _____. *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. *SNTSMS* 27, Cambridge: University Press, 1974.
- _____. "Matthew as a Creative Interpreter of the Sayings of Jesus", P. Stuhlmacher (ed.) *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 273-87.
- _____. "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Gospel: Matthean Scholarship from 1945-80", in Wolfgang Haase (ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* Series 11 25:3, 1889-1951 Principat. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985.
- _____. "The Origin and Purpose of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount", in G.F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz (eds.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987, 181-92.
- _____. "'Pray that your flight may not be in winter or on a Sabbath' (Matthew 24:20)", *JSNT* 37 (1989) 17-30.
- _____. "Salvation Proclaimed: X. Matthew 11:28-30: Comfortable Words?", *ET* 94 (1982) 3-8.
- _____. "A Structuralist Approach to Matthew" *Int* 43 (1989) 184-86.

Stark, Werner. *The Sociology of Religion: A Study of Christendom, Vol. II, Sectarian Religion*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das Gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. WMANT 23. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Stein, Robert. *An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.

_____. "What is Redaktionsgeschichte?", *JBL* 88 (1969) 45-56.

Stemberger, Günter. "Galilee – Land of Salvation?", in W. D. Davies, *Land*, 409-438.

Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament*. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XX. Uppsala: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954. Second edition, New Introduction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968.

_____. "Quis et Unde? An Analysis of Mathew 1-2", in Stanton, *Interpretation* 56-66.

Stock, Augustine. "Is Matthew's Presentation of Peter Ironic?", *BTB* 17 (1987) 64-69.

Strecker, Georg. *Die Bergpredigt: Ein Exegetischer Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984.

_____. "Die Makarismen der Bergpredigt", *NTS* 17 (1970-71) 255-75.

_____. *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus*. 3. Auf. FRLANT 82. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, (1962) 1971.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: Macmillan, 1926.

Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge: Harvard U. P., 1970.

Suhl, Alfred. *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965.

_____. "Der Davidsohn im Matthäus-Evangelium", *ZNW* 59 (1968) 57-81.

Syreeni, Kari. *The Making of the Sermon on the Mount: A Procedural Analysis of Matthew's redactional activity*. Part I: Methodology & Compositional Analysis. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae. Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 44. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987.

Tagawa, Kenzo. *Miracles et Évangile: La Pensée Personnelle de l'Évangéliste Marc*. Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses, 62. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.

_____. "People and Community in the Gospel of Matthew", *NTS* 16 (1970) 149-62.

Talbert, Charles H. *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels*. London: SPCK, 1978.

- Tannehill, Robert. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 2 Vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1986, 1990.
- Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Origin of Jesus Messiah (Matt. 1:1, 18a): Matthew's Use of the Infancy Traditions", *JBL* 96 (1977) 523-35.
- Teeple, Howard M. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*. JBLMS 10. Philadelphia: SBL, 1957.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity*, tr. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1978.
- . *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Ed. and tr. John H. Schütz. Studies in the N.T. and its World, ed. J. Riches. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982.
- . *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums*. WUNT 19. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1979.
- . *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*, Tr. Francis McDonagh. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Thieme, K. "Matthäus, der schriftgelehrte Evangelist", *Judaica* 5 (1949) 130-52, 161-82.
- Thompson, W.G. "An Historical Perspective in the Gospel of Matthew", *JBL* 93 (1974) 243-62.
- . *Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community: Matthew: 17:22-18:35*. AnBib 44 Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1970.
- . "Matthew's Portrait of Jesus' Disciples", *Bible Today* 19 (1981), 16-24.
- . "Reflections on the Composition of Mt. 8:1-9:34", *CBQ* 33 (1971) 365-88.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970.
- Thysman, Raymond. *Communauté et Directives Éthiques: La catéchèse de Matthieu: théologie morale du Nouveau Testament essai de synthèse*. Gembloux: Éditions Duculot, 1974.
- Tidball, Derek. *An Introduction to the Sociology of the New Testament*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1983.
- Tilborg, Sijef van. *The Jewish Leaders in Matthew*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Tödt, H.E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. tr. Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM, 1965.
- Tooley, Wilfred. "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus", *NovT* 7 (1964/5) 15-25.
- Trafton, Joseph L. *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 11. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

- Trilling, Wolfgang. "Amt und Amtverständnis bei Matthäus", *Mélanges Bibliques*, J. Duculot, Gembloux, 1970, 29-44.
- . "Der Einzug in Jerusalem Mt. 21:1-17" in J. Blinzler et al. (eds.) *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963, 303-09.
- . "Matthäus, das kirchliche Evangelium: Überlieferungsgeschichte und Theologie", J. Schreiner and G. Dautzenburg (eds.) *Gestalt und Anspruch des Neuen Testaments*, 2. Aufl. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1969.
- . "Die Täufertradition bei Matthäus", *BZ* 3 (1959) 271-89.
- . *Das Wahre Israel: Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums*. Dritte Aufl. StANT 10. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1964.
- Trotter, F. Thomas (ed.). *Jesus and the Historian*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1968.
- Turner, C. H. "Notes and Studies: Marcan Usage: Notes, Critical and Exegetical on the Second Gospel, Cont'd. V: The movements of Jesus and his disciples and the crowd". *JTS* 26 (1925) 225-40.
- Urbach, Ephraim E. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, tr. Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University, 1975, 2 vols.
- Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew*. London: SCM, 1983.
- Verseput, Donald J. *The Rejection of the Humble Messianic King: A Study of the Composition of Matthew 11-12*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1986.
- . "The Role and Meaning of the 'Son of God' Title in Matthew's Gospel", *NTS* 33 (1987) 532-56.
- Via, Dan O., Jr. "The Church as the Body of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew", *SJT* 11 (1958) 271-86.
- . "Matthew on the Understandability of the Parables", *JBL* 84 (1965) 430-32.
- . *Self-Deception and Wholeness in Paul and Matthew*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Viviano, B.T. "Where was the Gospel According to St. Matthew Written?", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 533-46.
- Vögtle, Anton. "Das christologische und ekklesiologische Anliegen von Mt. 28:18-20", *SE* 2, *TU* 87 (1964) 266-94.
- . *Messias und Gottessohn: Herkunft und Sinn der matthäischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.
- Volz, Paul. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlags, (1934) 1966.
- Walker, Rolf. *Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium*. FRLANT 91. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1967.
- Walter, N., "σπλάγχνον" *EWNT* III cols. 633-634.

- Weder, Hans. *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern: traditions- und redaktions-geschichtliche Analysen und Interpretation*. FRLANT 120. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1978.
- Weiss, A.F. "Φαρισαῖος", *TDNT* IX 35-48.
- Weiss, Bernhard. *Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lucas-Parallelen*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1876.
- Wenham, David. "The Structure of Matthew XIII", *NTS* 25 (1978-79) 516-22.
- Werner, Eric. "'Hosanna' in the Gospels", *JBL* 65 (1946) 97-122.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Jesus and Scribal Authority*. CB: New Testament Series, 10. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978.
- Westermann, Claus. *Vergleiche und Gleichnisse im Alten und Neuen Testament*. CTM 14. Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1984.
- Wilkens, Michael. *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel*. NovTSup 59. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988.
- Wilkens, Wilhelm. "Die Komposition des Matthäus-Evangeliums", *NTS* 31 (1985) 25-38.
- . "Die Redaktion des Gleichniskapitels Mark. 4 durch Matth.", *TZ* 20 (1964) 305-27.
- Wilson, Bryan. *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*. London: Heinemann, 1973.
- Windisch, Hans. *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount: A Contribution to the Historical Understanding of the Gospels and the Problem of their True Exegesis*. tr. S. MacLean Gilmour. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951.
- Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in Gospel Tradition*. SNTSMS 7. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.
- Winter, Paul. *On the Trial of Jesus*. 2nd, rev. ed. T. A. Burkill and Geza Vermes (eds.) 1972. SJ I. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1961.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Jesaja im Urchristentum*, 4. Aufl. Giessen: Brunnen Verlag, 1984.
- Wrede, Wilhelm. "Jesus als Davidssohn", in *Vorträge und Studien*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1907, 147-77.
- . *Das Messiasgeheimnis in der Evangelien: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Dritte, unveränderte Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht (1901) 1963.
- Wrege, Hans-Theo. *Die Gestalt des Evangeliums: Aufbau und Struktur der Synoptiker sowie der Apostelgeschichte*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie II. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1978.
- Young, Franklin, W. "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-examination", *JBL* 48 (1949) 285-99.
- Zarella, P.P. "L'entrata di Gesù in Gerusalemme nella Redazione di Matteo", in *La*

Distruzione di Gerusalemme del 70. Collectio Assisiensis 8. Assisi: Studio Teologico 'Porziuncola', 1971, 111-33.

Zeller, Dieter. *Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den synoptikern.* FB. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977.

Zingg, Paul. *Das Wachsen der Kirche.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

Zizemer, Osmar. *Das Verhältnis zwischen Jesus and Volk im Markusevangelium.* Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München, 1983.

Zmijewski, Josef. "παλιθος", *EWNT* III, col. 245-49.

———. "Der Glaube und seine Macht. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mt 17,20; 21,21; Mk 11,23; Lk 17,6" in J. Zmijewski and E. Nellessen (eds.) *Begegnung mit dem Wort.* Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1980, 81-103.

Zumstein, Jean. *La Condition de Croyant dans l'Évangile selon Matthieu.* OBO 16. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1977.

———. "Matthieu 28:16-20", *RThPh* 22 (1972) 14-33.